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### Framing

#### Neoliberalism has infilitrated the academy.It has sacrificed the academy and higher education as a site for knowledge production and critical dialogue. Objectviity is a lie- ethical standpoints have been constructed by neoliberalism and hides true inequality. The role of the ballot is to fight neoliberalism through post-fiat consequences of governmental policy

**Giroux 13** [Henry A. Giroux (McMaster Univeristy Professor for Scholarship in Public Interest and the Paulo Freire Distingusiehd Scholar in Critical Pedagogy”, 10-29-2013, "Henry A. Giroux," Truthout, <http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university>] NB

And while Lourde refers to poetry here, I think a strong case can be made that the attributes she ascribes to poetry can also be attributed  to higher education - a genuine higher education.[2](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university#II)  In this case, an education that includes history, philosophy, all of the arts and humanities, the criticality of the social sciences, the world of discovery made manifest by science, and the transformations in health and in law wrought by the professions that are fundamental to what it means to know something about the human condition. Lourde's defense of poetry as a mode of education is especially crucial for those of us who believe that the university is nothing if it is not a public trust and social good; that is a critical institution infused with the promise of cultivating intellectual insight, the imagination, inquisitiveness, risk-taking, social responsibility and the struggle for justice. At best, universities should be at the "heart of intense public discourse, passionate learning and vocal citizen involvement in the issues of the times."[3](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university#NA) It is in the spirit of such an ideal that I first want to address those larger economic, social, and cultural interests that threaten this notion of education, especially higher education. Across the globe, the forces of casino capitalism are on the march. With the return of the Gilded Age and its dream worlds of consumption, privatization and deregulation, not only are democratic values and social protections at risk, but the civic and formative cultures that make such values and protections crucial to democratic life are in danger of disappearing altogether.  As public spheres, once enlivened by broad engagements with common concerns, are being transformed into "spectacular spaces of consumption," the flight from mutual obligations and social responsibilities intensifies and has resulted in what Tony Judt identifies as a "loss of faith in the culture of open democracy."[4](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university#III) This loss of faith in the power of public dialogue and dissent is not unrelated to the diminished belief in higher education as central to producing critical citizens and a crucial democratic public sphere in its own right. At stake here is not only the meaning and purpose of higher education, but also civil society, politics and the fate of democracy itself. Thomas Frank is on target when he argues that "Over the course of the past few decades, the power of concentrated money has subverted professions, destroyed small investors, wrecked the regulatory state, corrupted legislators en masse and repeatedly put the economy through the wringer. Now it has come for our democracy itself."[5](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university#IV) And, yet, the only questions being asked about knowledge production, the purpose of education, the nature of politics, and our understanding of the future are determined largely by market forces. The mantras of neoliberalism are now well known: Government is the problem; Society is a fiction; Sovereignty is market-driven; Deregulation and commodification are vehicles for freedom; and Higher education should serve corporate interests rather than the public good. In addition, the yardstick of profit has become the only viable measure of the good life, while civic engagement and public spheres devoted to the common good are viewed by many politicians and their publics as either a hindrance to the goals of a market-driven society or alibis for government inefficiency and waste. In a market-driven system in which economic and political decisions are removed from social costs, the flight of critical thought and social responsibility is further accentuated by what Zygmunt Bauman calls "ethical tranquillization."[6](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university#V) One result is a form of depoliticization that works its way through the social order, removing social relations from the configurations of power that shape them, substituting what Wendy Brown calls "emotional and personal vocabularies for political ones in formulating solutions to political problems." Consequently, it becomes difficult for young people too often bereft of a critical education to translate private troubles into public concerns. As private interests trump the public good, public spaces are corroded, and short-term personal advantage replaces any larger notion of civic engagement and social responsibility.   Under such circumstances, to cite C. W. Mills, we are witnessing the breakdown of democracy, the disappearance of critical intellectuals and "the collapse of those public spheres which offer a sense of critical agency and social imagination."[8](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university#VII)   Mill's prescient comments amplify what has become a tragic reality. Missing from neoliberal market societies are those public spheres - from public and higher education to the mainstream media and digital screen culture - where people can develop what might be called the civic imagination. For example, in the last few decades, we have seen market mentalities attempt to strip education of its public values, critical content and civic responsibilities as part of its broader goal of creating new subjects wedded to consumerism, risk-free relationships and the disappearance of the social state in the name of individual, expanded choice.  Tied largely to instrumental ideologies and measurable paradigms, many institutions of higher education are now committed almost exclusively to economic goals, such as preparing students for the workforce - all done as part of an appeal to rationality, one that eschews matters of inequality, power and the ethical grammars of suffering.[9](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university#VIII)  Many universities have not only strayed from their democratic mission, they also seem immune to the plight of students who face a harsh new world of high unemployment, the prospect of downward mobility and debilitating debt. The question of what kind of education is needed for students to be informed and active citizens in a world that increasingly ignores their needs, if not their future, is rarely asked.[10](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university#IX) In the absence of a democratic vision of schooling, it is not surprising that some colleges and universities are increasingly opening their classrooms to corporate interests, standardizing the curriculum, instituting top-down governing structures, and generating courses that promote entrepreneurial values unfettered by social concerns or ethical consequences. For example, one university is offering a master's degree to students who, in order to fulfill their academic requirements, have to commit to starting a high-tech company. Another university allows career officers to teach capstone research seminars in the humanities. In one of these classes, the students were asked to "develop a 30-second commercial on their 'personal brand.' "[11](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university#X) This is not an argument against career counseling or research in humanities seminars, but the confusion in collapsing the two. Central to this neoliberal view of higher education in the United States and United Kingdom is a market-driven paradigm that seeks to eliminate tenure, turn the humanities into a job preparation service, and transform most faculty into an army of temporary subaltern labor For instance, in the United States out of 1.5 million faculty members, 1 million are "adjuncts who are earning, on average, $20,000 a year gross, with no benefits or healthcare, no unemployment insurance when they are out of work."[12](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university#XI) The indentured service status of such faculty is put on full display as some colleges have resorted to using "temporary service agencies to do their formal hiring."[13](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university#XII) There is little talk in this view of higher education about the history and value of shared governance between faculty and administrators, nor of educating students as critical citizens rather than potential employees of Walmart. There are few attempts to affirm faculty as scholars and public intellectuals who have both a measure of autonomy and power. Instead, faculty members are increasingly defined less as intellectuals than as technicians and grant writers. Students fare no better in this debased form of education and are treated as either clients or as restless children in need of high-energy entertainment - as was made clear in the 2012 Penn State scandal. Such modes of education do not foster a sense of organized responsibility fundamental to a democracy. Instead, they encourage what might be called a sense of organized irresponsibility - a practice that underlies the economic Darwinism and civic corruption at the heart of a debased politics.

#### Modern oppression and institutionalized violence are a result of political ignorance, isolationism, and egoism that makes minorities disposable

**Giroux 13** [Giroux, Henry. "Violence Is Deeply Rooted in American Culture:." Leolienne. N.p., 13 Jan. 2013. Web. <http://www.leolienne.com/bamablog/index.php/categories/28-learning/essatorials/1158-henry-giroux-violence-deeply-routed-in-american-culture>.] KB access 12/1/15

In the US there is an institutionalized regime of neoliberal violence directed against low income people, poor minorities, immigrants, the disabled, and others now considered disposable under a ruthless and savage fanatical capitalism that luxuriates in the poisonous dream worlds of commodification, deregulation, consumption, and privatization. Within this regime of neoliberal violence, the politics of disposability is shored up by the assumption that some lives and social relationships are not worthy of a meaningful social existence, empathy and social protections. For instance, those considered “other” because of their lack of capital, consuming power, or alleged refusal to accept the unethical grammar of an Atlas Shrugged winner-take-all ethos are now relegated to zones of abandonment and terminal exclusion. Lacking social protections, such populations increasingly are addressed within the growing reach of the punishing state, as a source of entertainment, or are relegated to what the French philosopher Etienne Balibar calls the "death zones of humanity."[6] In a culture defined by excessive inequality, suffering, and cruelty, the protective covering of the state, along with the public values and the formative culture necessary for a democracy is corrupted, increasingly dismantled, and held in contempt. And the disposable are not merely those populations caught in extreme poverty. Increasingly, they are individuals and groups now ravaged by bad mortgages, poor credit and huge debt. They are the growing army of the unemployed forced to abandon their houses, credit cards and ability to consume -- a liability that pushes them to the margins of a market society. These are the groups whose homes will not be covered by insurance, who have no place to live, no resources to fall back on, no way to imagine that the problems they will be facing are not just personal, but deeply structural, built into a system that views the social contract and the welfare state as a lethal disease. In this economic Darwinist measure of value, those marginalized by race and class, who might detract from, rather than enlarge another's wealth are not only demonized, but are also viewed as problematic in that they become burdens to be disposed of, rather than a valuable and treasured human resource in which to invest. The discourse of disposability is not limited to right-wing politicians, but it is also built into the vocabulary of neoliberal governmental policy. Market societies are ruled by a predatory form of economic Darwinism in which greed and avarice are legitimated through a war-against-all, survival-of-the-fittest mentality that embraces a near sociopathic lack of interest in others and provides few social protections against individual and collective misfortune while at the same time dismissing the value of social provisions. As the sociologist Elliott Currie has pointed out, neoliberal societies have become criminogenic in that they destroy peoples’ livelihoods, withdraw public supports, create massive extremes of economic inequality, erode social bonds while creating debilitating forms of atomization, promote materialistic values that produce a culture of callousness, corrupt the political process, and market a form of normalized brutality evident in the massive rise of corporate crime and a culture of corruption.[7] Neoliberalism represents a full-fledged assault on democratic values, relations, and public spheres and does so by universalizing its own ideology, policies, and modes of governance. Its logic of disposability reduces citizenship to the logic of consumerism, reinforces the dominance of public life by giant corporations, and produces what the anthropologist Joao Biel calls a “machinery of social death.” In fact, the “machinery of social death,” is fed by corporate investments in the organized production of violence for profit and I am not just talking about industries that make big profits as part of the military-industrial complex. As New York Times journalist Andrew Ross Sorkin states, what has been overlooked in the recent debate about gun worship in the United States is that some of the biggest gun makers are “owned by private equity funds run by Wall Street titan.” For instance, Cerberus Capital Management, Sciens Capital Management, and MidOcean Partners make big profits selling everything from Ak-47s to military-grade night-vision goggles.[8] The technology of death is a big profit maker for Wall Street and makes clear that neoliberalism is actively engaged in the production of a dystopian society in which people, resources, and goods are now considered throwaways, just as moral responsibility is detached from actions, and politics is removed from the promise of a substantive democracy.

#### Education is increasingly driven by neoliberal forces – student activism is key to retake the political sphere.

**Williams 15** [Jo Williams (Lecturer, College of Education at Victoria University), "Remaking education from below: the Chilean student movement as public pedagogy," Australian Journal of Adult Learning, November 2015]

More than ever the crisis of schooling represents, at large, the crisis of democracy itself and any attempt to understand the attack on public schooling and higher education cannot be separated from the wider assault on all forms of public life not driven by the logic of the market (Giroux, 2003:7) “Fin al lucro en educación, nuestros sueños no les pertenecen” (end profit making in education, nobody owns our dreams 1 ) (slogan of the Chilean student movement, inspired by the French student uprisings of May-June 1968) Over the past four decades, as the economic and ideological depravity of neoliberal policy and its market-driven logic (D. W. Hursh & Henderson, 2011) has been brought to bear on every aspect of education, the very concept of ‘public’ has been negated. Characteristics such as user-pays, competition, assaults on teachers, and mass standardised-testing and rankings, are among the features of a schooling, which is now very much seen as a private rather than public good (Giroux, 2003). The question of public education as a democratic force for the radical transformation of a violently unjust society seems rarely if ever asked, and a dangerous co-option and weakening of the language and practice of progressive pedagogy has occurred to the extent that notions of inclusion and success are increasingly limited to narrowly conceived individualist and competitive measures of market advantage. As Giroux notes “the forces of neo-liberalism dissolve public issues into utterly privatised and individualistic concerns (2004:62), and despite ongoing official rhetoric “the only form of citizenship increasingly being offered to young people is consumerism” (2003:7). Neoliberal education sees students and young people as passive consumers, the emphasis of schooling on learning how to be governed rather than how to govern (Giroux, 2003:7). In such a context the space for a public pedagogy, based on challenging the hegemony of neoliberal ideology and aligned with collective resistance, appears limited at best. And yet, every day people, teachers, students and communities do engage in political struggle, enacting pedagogies that seek to unveil rather than continue to mask the political structures and organisation that ensures power remains in the hands of the few, and at the service of the few, at the expense of the rest of us. Giroux characterises public pedagogies as defined by hope, struggle and a politicisation of the education process. He argues for …a politics of resistance that extends beyond the classroom as part of a broader struggle to challenge those forces of neo-liberalism that currently wage war against all collective structures capable of defending vital social institutions as a public good (Giroux, 2003:14). Central to Giroux’s argument is the need for critical educators to look to, value, and engage in and with social movements as they emerge and develop as sites of resistance. To …take sides, speak out, and engage in the hard work of debunking corporate culture’s assault on teaching and learning, orient their teaching for social change, connect learning to public life [and] link knowledge to the operations of power (Giroux, 2004:77). He argues that “[p]rogressive education in an age of rampant neoliberalism requires an expanded notion of the public, pedagogy, solidarity, and democratic struggle” (Giroux, 2003:13), and that moreover, educators need to work against a “politics of certainty” and instead develop and engage in pedagogical practice that problematises the world and fosters a sense of collective resistance and hope (2003:14). A neoliberal vision of the ‘good citizen’ and ‘good student’ presumes passivity, acceptance of the status quo and an individualistic disposition. Critical pedagogues must seek out and embrace opportunities to support and celebrate collective political action, not only because it develops a sense of social and political agency but also because it constitutes a powerful basis for authentic learning and active and critical citizenship in an unjust world (Freire, 1970). The Chilean student movement stands as one such example of challenging and inspiring counter-practice and a reclaiming of pedagogy as political and public. For ten years students have filled Chile’s streets, occupied their schools and universities, and organised conferences, public Remaking education from below: the Chilean student movement as public pedagogy 499 meetings, political stunts, creative actions and protests. Students and young people have been at the centre of the largest and most sustained political action seen in Chile since the democratic movement of the 80s, which eventually forced out the Pinochet dictatorship. Despite global trends in the opposite direction, the Chilean students have fundamentally influenced a nationwide education reform program constituting significant changes to the existing system which has been described as an extreme example of market-driven policy (Valenzuela, Bellei, & Ríos, 2014:220). Most importantly, they have forced and led a nationwide dialogue on the question of education and social justice in Chile and an interrogation of the current, grossly inequitable and elitist model (Falabella, 2008). This article begins by reviewing the experiences of the Chilean student movement to date and offering a brief explanation of the historical development of the education system it seeks to dismantle. It then considers the movement as an example of public pedagogies, concluding with a discussion of how it might inform notions of radical educational practice and a return of the student and pedagogue as authentic and critical subjects.

### UQ/Inherency

#### Universities currently restrict free speech- that stifles protests and key intellectual discussion necessary for progressivism

**Maloney 16** [Cliff Maloney, Jr., Oct 13, 2016, "Colleges Have No Right to Limit Students' Free Speech," TIME, <http://time.com/4530197/college-free-speech-zone/>] NB

In grade school, I learned that debate is defined as “a discussion between people in which they express different opinions about something.” Such open discourse was historically encouraged on our college campuses. Universities exemplified intellectual discussion and debate in America. [No one voiced their opinions louder](http://time.com/4106357/student-protest-1970-2015/) than students, professors and administrators. They pushed society’s limits by admitting women and people of color, and by encouraging [diversity of thought](http://time.com/3890722/the-silencing-college/) amongst the [college community](http://time.com/4347099/college-campus-protests/). Historically, young people flocked to universities to learn more about the world around them, to encounter people from different backgrounds, to expand their minds and to form their own opinions. Unfortunately, things have changed. Recently on college campuses, our open discourse has been threatened, particularly when discussing politics. While the current presidential election represents polarizing wings of both the Democratic and Republican parties, we should be able to openly debate their policies and the direction in which they plan to take our country if elected. We should be able to discuss the abuse of power within our government and the consistent violations of our Bill of Rights. We should be able to participate in the free market of ideas. But our students are being silenced. University campuses are now home to a plethora of speech restrictions. From [sidewalk-sized “free-speech zones”](http://www.forbes.com/sites/realspin/2013/09/13/how-one-college-student-fought-his-schools-free-speech-zone-and-won/" \t "_blank) to the criminalization of [microaggressions](http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2016/09/colleges-are-defining-microaggressions-really-broadly.html" \t "_blank), America’s college campuses look and feel a lot more like an authoritarian dictatorship than they do the academic hubs of the modern free world. When rolling an inflated free-speech ball around campus, students at the University of Delaware were [halted by campus police](http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/07/education/edlife/constitution-free-speech-first-amendment.html?_r=0" \t "_blank) for their activities. A Young Americans for Liberty leader at Fairmont State University in West Virginia [was confronted by security](http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2016/sep/15/fairmont-state-university-wva-halts-conservative-c/" \t "_blank) when he was attempting to speak with other students about the ideas he believes in. A man at Clemson University was [barred from praying on campus](http://www.charlotteobserver.com/news/state/south-carolina/article98993982.html" \t "_blank) because he was outside of the free-speech zone. And a student at Blinn College in Texas [abolished her campus’ free-speech zone](http://2o9kb51xfph91b7rki281uu9.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Blinn050316LawsuitSettlement.pdf" \t "_blank) in a lawsuit after administrators demanded she seek special permission to advocate for self-defense. How have we let this happen in America, the land of the free? It’s because of what our universities have taught a generation of Americans: If you don’t agree with someone, are uncomfortable with an idea, or don’t find a joke funny, then their speech must be suppressed. [Especially if they don’t politically agree with you](http://www.thecollegefix.com/post/26350/" \t "_blank). Instead of actually debating ideas that span topics from the conventional to the taboo, a generation of American students don’t engage, they just [get enraged](http://www.campusreform.org/?ID=7528" \t "_blank). In doing so, many students believe that they [have a right to literally shut other people up](http://reason.com/blog/2016/09/14/video-more-crazed-yale-students-attack-s" \t "_blank). This is not only a threat to the First Amendment, but also to American democracy. In their manifestation, safe spaces and free-speech zones at public universities enable prejudice against unfavorable ideologies. Guised as progressive measures to ensure inclusion, these often unconstitutional policies exclude new and competing ideas, and are antithetical to a free academia. In excluding different ideologies, supposedly progressive campus speech codes do one thing: prevent the progression of ideas. Restrictive campus speech codes are, in fact, regressive.

#### The alt right is already energized in the status quo- students already engage in harmful dialogue.

**Harkinson 12-6** [Harkinson, Josh. “The Push to Enlist ‘Alt-Right’ Recruits on College Campuses. Dec 6, 2016. <http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2016/12/richard-spencer-alt-right-college-activism>. ]

How much support is there for the loose-knit coalition of white nationalists and other far-right extremists known as [the "alt-right"](http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2016/11/trump-white-nationalists-hate-racism-power" \t "_blank)? Despite a spike in media coverage for the movement in the wake of Donald Trump's victory, a recent conference hosted by white nationalist Richard Spencer, who coined the term "alt-right," drew only about 275 attendees in Washington, DC. And after [a video](http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/11/richard-spencer-speech-npi/508379/" \t "_blank) from the event went viral, showing audience members giving Nazi salutes to Spencer's cry of "hail Trump," the movement faced a fierce backlash. Although Trump named [alt-right hero](http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2016/08/stephen-bannon-donald-trump-alt-right-breitbart-news" \t "_blank) Stephen Bannon as his chief White House strategist, the president-elect went on to disavow the alt-right—in general terms, at least—in an interview with the New York Times. The movement [gained momentum online in 2016](http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2016/11/trump-white-nationalists-hate-racism-power" \t "_blank) but is no longer just [about social media](http://www.demographicspro.com/insights/trump-supporters-follow-white-nationalists-on-twitter" \t "_blank), says Spencer; he sees a need to prove that the alt-right can attract supporters in the real world. And he says the best place to do that is on college campuses, starting with a speech he plans to deliver on Tuesday on the campus of Texas A&M University. "People in college are at this point in their lives where they are actually open to alternative perspectives, for better and for worse," Spencer says. "I think you do need to get them while they are young. I think rewiring the neurons of someone over 50 is effectively impossible." Recruiting on college campuses has long been a goal for "academic racists" such as Jared Taylor and Peter Brimelow, a white nationalist whom Spencer helped bring to Duke University for an event in 2007, [when Spencer was a student there](http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2016/10/richard-spencer-trump-alt-right-white-nationalist" \t "_blank). In May, Spencer and other white nationalists set up a "safe space" on the University of California-Berkeley's Sproul Plaza to discuss "how race affects people of European heritage." He claims that he will be giving two more speeches about the alt-right at universities in California. "The left just owns academia through and through," Spencer says, "so I think it is important to go to the belly of the beast and not let them own it." In recent months, Breitbart News pundit Milo Yiannopoulos' "Dangerous Faggot Tour" drew crowds at college campuses around the country. Several colleges canceled scheduled talks by Yiannopoulos because of "security concerns." Yiannopoulos does not label himself "alt-right" but has characterized the movement as a legitimate response to political correctness. He often describes white males as victims of "reverse discrimination" and speaks euphemistically of defending "Western values." [A talk that he gave on the alt-right](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-7-dAmdy-JE" \t "_blank) at the University of Houston in September drew cheers and a chant invoking the name of the alt-right mascot Pepe the Frog. "That was a revelation for me," Spencer said about Yiannopoulos' talk. "What we are doing is known to people, it's edgy and dangerous, it's cool and hip. It's that thing our parents don't want us to do. So that was definitely a huge inspiration." University campuses historically have incubated a range of social movements, from Marxism to multiculturalism on the left to right-wing movements such as neoliberalism and fascism, including [Nazism in Germany](https://www.facinghistory.org/holocaust-and-human-behavior/chapter-5/controlling-universities" \t "_blank) ([and in the United States](https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2009/06/17/nazism" \t "_blank)).

#### The state seeks contains protestors and geopolitically isolates protest from politics- the impact is the destruction of alternate futures

Elmer and Opel 08 [Greg- Director of the Infoscape research lab and Bell Globemedia Research Chair @ Ryerson University, and Andy, associate professor Dept. of Communication @ Florida State University, Preempting Dissent: The Politics of an Inevitable Future, p. 30-31 , GAL]

This chapter argues that in the shadow of 9/11, the war in Iraq, and the ongoing “War on Terror,” a disturbing form of geopolitical apartheid has emerged in the United States. At the core of this trend is a set of micro-political strategies and technologies that attempt to contain spaces of dissent and detain protestors (Boghosian, 2004). Some activists and critics have labeled these anti-democratic tendencies the “Miami Model,” after the strategies deployed in November 2003 against Free Trade of the Americas protestors by federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies stationed in Miami. The Miami model of law enforcement was characterized by 1) the deployment of overwhelming numbers of law enforcement officers, 2) preemptive arrests of peaceful and law-abiding protestors, and 3) widespread police surveillance techniques before, during, and after protests (Getzan, 2004). And while these three pillars—overwhelming force, preemptive arrests, and surveillance—provide a good overview of police and law enforcement strategies, in this chapter we focus briefly on the manner in which spaces of dissent, debate, and democracy are being regulated and policed through the courts, going into more depth in the next chapter, through a study of the introduction of weapons meant to easily contain and detain protestors and, more broadly, immobilize dissent. Of greater concern is the degree to which such strategies systematically marginalize dissent, spatially and politically speaking. From the creation of “free speech zones” and the proposal for protest- free “Pedestrian Safety Zones” to the political screening of participants in political “town hall meetings,” space has increasingly become a tool to limit open debate, freedom of speech, and political dissent in the US. The ability to control dissent, disagreement, and public protest is critical to the nexus of preemptive logic and what we have called faith-based politics. Conflictual, risky, or potentially dangerous futures have precipitated the suspension of rights, and highlighted the need for other modes of articulating a radical present that privileges action over contemplation. In the absence of reliable intelligence, the development and adoption of futures markets has invoked the need to base decisions on faith or gut instinct, amplified through the introduction of monetary forms of wagering. Futures markets, unlike polls or elections, prey directly upon fear, insecurity, and cynicism—don’t tell us want you want or would like, but rather tell us what you actually think is going to be the most likely outcome. Unlike the major financial markets that trade in futures, DARPA’s terrorist futures market in no uncertain terms self-defines as an insider trading market—again a place where nefarious actors, not market researchers or economists, are called upon to self-inform for financial gain. This move further advances the shift from citizen to consumer, turning a vote into a bet, and the winner takes all. This brief critique of democracy, this exposition of faith-based politics, leaves room for the further exploration of the rhetoric of inevitability—the public articulation of no possibilities, and an attendant fixed future. This rhetoric is essential to faith-based politics, one enacted through a negative rhetoric. In other words, those who question inevitable futures are said to actually produce a state of insecurity, to give assistance to “our enemies.” Faith then becomes the only path to security, the only way to prevent the inevitable future from engulfing the radical present. Dissent is a display of a lack of faith to the degree that the very act of asking a question becomes an invitation to disaster. As the case of Andrew Meyer at the University of Florida so succinctly encapsulated, the very act of asking a political figure to explain himself invited the Taser shock, created the need to discipline the dissenter and instill compliance in a global audience of potential questioners. To lose faith, however, is to demand choices, to interrogate the absolute need for secrecy. We call for a loss of faith to facilitate dissent and disagreement, to accommodate inconvenient moments and acts of civil disobedience—in short, to ensure that contemplation, discussion, and deliberation remain core elements of a vibrant democratic political culture. While this chapter highlights the preemptive means of containing protesters and spaces of dissent, broader trends toward a system of geopolitical apartheid are in many respects more complex and diffuse. The state’s ability to spatially segregate competing political viewpoints, often under the guise of security, has, in our view, caused extensive and possibly longlasting damage to the notion of freedom of assembly and political dissent in public spaces. As an offshoot of the “War on Terror,” we have found that the doctrine of preemption often binds together a litany of segregationist strategies with a new set of technologies that together reconfigure public space and the contours of public assembly. Law-enforcement weapons also integrate a preemptive logic that favours action over contemplation. Thus, in attempting to anticipate dissent, the state is increasingly reacting with a form of violence that seeks to contain and immobilize political actors (as Agamben and Bigo have argued) into predetermined spaces, metaphorically separating the political mainstream from so-called marginal voices.

### Solvency

#### Protests have been essential to deconstruct facets of the neoliberal university- multiple empirics prove

**Delgado 15** [Delgado, Sandra. “The Pedagogical Potential of Student Collective Action in the Age of the Corporate University” (Doctoral Student in curriculum studies at the university of british Columbia). Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy. University of British Columbia. 2015] NB

One recent movement that has integrated classic and creative repertoires of action is the Chilean student movement of 2011. Among the range of strategies and repertoires of contention that the movement employed, this movement became well-known by the use of creative street performances that were based on the ideas of non-violence, joy, love and carnival. Contextually, the movement emerged as a civil response to the fact that in recent years higher education in Chile has been overtaken by neoliberal reforms that have left about 70% of Chilean students overwhelmed by expensive education loans (Somma, 2012). The student movement advocated free education, the end of for-profit institutions (78% of the funding sources of higher education in Chile are private, according to Bellei, Cabalin and Orellana, 2014), the defense of public education, and the elimination of schools with discriminatory practices (Bellei et al., 2014). In Chile, students are considered important political actors (Guzman-Concha, 2012; Simbuerger & Neary, 2014; Somma, 2012) since, historically, they have been a very active political force. Student federations are a prominent part of student politics in Chile. In 2011, these traditional student organizations incorporated their experiences of previous struggles bringing not only historical grounds to the movement but also contributing with practical and methodological tools to strengthen the movement’s repertoires, narratives and discourses (Guzman-Concha, 2012, p. 414) One of the tactics that reflect the pedagogical aspects of student organizing mentioned above is the employment of irony and humor to illustrate the burden of student debt, provoke critical reflection to the public and incite people to take action. For example, one of the ideas that Chilean students used the most as a humor device was the idea of Love. Marches and kiss-ins (besatones) were filled with messages that included both, meanings associated to the idea of love and the feelings and experiences of being in debt. Students, most of the cases, either compared or contrasted both ideas by using sarcasm and irony. For example, students used messages such as: “our love is infinite, our money would not last that much”, “I would like to be a student loan, so we could be together for the rest of our lives”, “We are deeply in love but most of all we are dangerously in debt”, and “if love is free, why education is not?” Students’ messages reflect an antagonistic logic of two concepts that inspire opposite feelings, where the idea of love has a positive connotation and debt, on the contrary, brings sorrow and anguish. Hence, the associate meanings of love are not transferable to the idea of debt without becoming a joke. The messages used by Chilean students underline the idea that love and affection could potentially be disruptive for the logic of debt and economization and their suggestion, open to interpretation, is that society should think and organize an education system that incorporates the logic of love instead of the logic of economic growth and profit. Another dimension of the pedagogical potential of student performances and repertoires of contention is illustrated by the evolution in the arguments that students used during their negotiations. As Somma (2012) shows the movement developed comprehensive and sound understandings of how the Chilean education system works. Strategies the movement needed to employ were precisely pedagogical, in the sense that students organized themselves to gain and share more knowledge about the ways in which the Chilean higher education system works. This effort suggested a pedagogical endeavor not only for understanding particular information, data and specialized knowledge about the reality of Chilean education, but also developing the language and the tools needed to make that knowledge translatable (Somma, 2012). Both aspects were important for the movement in order to publically challenge the discourses that government officials used to gain the public’s attention and delegitimize the movement. These dynamics illustrate an internal organization, pursuing the intention to learn and share information about the issue that students were caring about, and directly speaks to Holt’s insight about curiosity, “it grows out of real concerns and real need.” (Holt, 2004, p. 12). The student movement in Colombia led by the Mesa Amplia Nacional Estudiantil – MANE – used performances and repertoires similar to those employed in the 2011 Chilean movement. In the Colombian context, as it is described by Archila (2011), the movement originated after the government attempted to reform the national law called “Ley 30 de 1990,” that defined how universities receive their funding. The reform sought to increase competition among institutions and encourage the advance of corporate managerialism to carry out the day- to-day operations of the universities. In their movement, Colombian students employed both classic repertoires such as strikes, mobilizations, assemblies, and creative strategies, such as kiss- ins and marches using humor, costumes and ironical and sarcastic frames. Additionally, they added contextual elements from national carnivals and holiday festivities (Archila, 2011). One element particularly helpful to understand the pedagogical potential of the movement tactics and the symbolic aspects of their performances of contention is the strategy called “pupitrazo.” This strategy consists of moving desk and chairs (pupitres) outside of the university classrooms, to public parks, streets and outdoor areas to either have lessons there or to discuss and debate particular issues of interest. This strategy had dual objectives. The first goal was to disrupt the logic that universities are contained within the boundaries of enclosed spaces. By using this strategy, students opened a space where they could inquiry into the purposes of their own education and the connections that their studentship has and potentially could have when it meets social reality, inequities, poverty and so on. Secondly, students also disrupted the quotidian use of streets, parks and public spaces by physically occupying them as spaces to learn and debate. The strategy provokes reflection among participants and observers about the public character of higher education and the artificial separations between academic institutions, knowledge, and social reality as it is presented day by day, out in the streets. Among other examples of the pedagogical potential of students’ performances and repertoires of contention, Fernández (2014) analyses the use of “Book Blocs” as a type of action used in contemporary student protests. This strategy become famous for its use in the building occupations carried out by UK students in 2010. Fernández explains how by using “Book Blocs” students borrow symbols and meanings traditionally associated to the academy. Book blocs are big rectangular pieces of cardboard with colorful images of covers from books that are well- known for being sources of inspiration, reflection and critical thought (e.g. the covers of Marx’s Capital, Fanon’s The Wretched of the Earth, Tillich’s DE schooling Society, De Beauvoir’s The Second Sex, etc.). As Ambler puts it, students “do not shield themselves behind knowledge, but hold before them the symbolic promise of all the radical traditions of oppositional knowledge and politics signified through these works” (Amsler, 2011, p. 5). These pieces are used as the front line to open marches, to block buildings, or as banners and signs located around campuses. They represent the relations that the movements have with intellectual theories and philosophical thinking, allowing a space where “social theory is materialized not only in practice, but as practice” (Amsler, 2011, p. 5). Fernandez (2014), Ambler (2011) and others have argued that “Book Blocs” are also a good example of the diffusion of knowledge among contemporary student movements, since the initiative was created by students in Italy and quickly spread to Spain, London and even more recently it was part of student demonstrations at City University of New York in the US. One of the most studied and theorized repertoires of contention is the occupation of buildings and in the case of students, the occupation of campuses. For instance, Lewis (2013) argues that blockades and building occupations allow an interaction between people and ideas, since it opens a space for them to converge in a state of suspension because in building occupations, for example, students have the opportunity to organize themselves by assuring the availability of “free time” and “free space” to think and struggle. As Fernandez (2014) argues occupations have the goal of achieving “the social time necessary to articulate the protest and, at the same time, to break with the faculty daily routine and visualize the conflict inside the institution” (p. 207). Taking the argument even further, Lewis (2013) argues that occupations have the particularity that allows students the chance to reclaim the “state of suspension” that belongs to the act of studying something. Hence, by blocking their buildings students gain back their “free time” needed to seriously study an issue, space that is no longer granted by the corporate university. “Letting things idle through occupation stops or interrupts the incessant need for ‘results’ and is itself a kind of impotent result, or a result that withdraws from calculation and measures” (p. 154). Occupations disrupt the economic logics that have overtaken learning, such as calculation, accountability; testing, etc. these aspects of the economic world are deeply entrenched into today’s forms of corporatized learning, and are part of the bio-politics of neoliberal capitalism. When students disrupt this logic they are reclaiming the essence of what it means to study (Lewis, 2013). Often, when the literature refers to students, it does so in a way that locates them as if their social value were tangible only in the future. In other words, students’ possibilities to transform reality is not placed in the present, but somewhere in the future, either at the moment when they have their degree, or get a job, or are acknowledged as incorporated in the economic system of production. By taking an approach that accounts for the pedagogical and political possibilities that students social action has in the present, students gain back their transformative potential not as an abstract end that waits to be made present, but as part of the actual moment they are living as students (Fernández, 2014; Weiss, Aspinall, Abinales, & Ortmann, 2012).Student social action then becomes a vehicle by itself that offers the possibility to engage here and now, as part of a process of becoming that starts and has roots in the present moment (Malott & Ford, 2015). Furthermore, student’s repertoires of contention and direct action can be understood as part of what Vinson and Ross (2011, 2013) call “dangerous citizenship”, since as they argue: The pedagogical power of “dangerous citizenship,” resides in its capacity to encourage students ... to challenge the implications of their own education or work, to envision an education that is free and democratic to the core, and to interrogate and uncover their own well-intentioned complicity in the conditions within which various cultural texts and practices appear, especially to the extent that oppressive conditions create oppressive cultural practices, and vice versa. (Ross & Vinson, 2013, p. 15) Therefore, student movements and their repertoires of contention have the potential to be alternative spaces that facilitate formative and pedagogical experiences as they contribute to critical reflection, social engagement and action on specific social issues.

#### Counterspeech is especially effective- it bolsters campus-wide movements and mitigates the risk of dealing with censorship issues which sacrifices focus on the movement

**Calleros 95** [Calleros, Charles R. “Paternalism, Counterspeech, and Campus Hate-Speech Codes: A Reply to Delgado and Yun” (Professor of Law, Arizona State University). HeinOnline. Arizona State Law Journal. 1995] NB

Delgado and Yun summarize the support for the counterspeech argument by paraphrasing Nat Hentoff: "[A]ntiracism rules teach black people to depend on whites for protection, while talking back clears the air, emphasizes self-reliance, and strengthens one's self-image as an active agent inchargeofone'sowndestiny."50 DelgadoandYunalsocitetothosewho believe that counterspeech may help educate the racist speaker by addressing 51 the ignorance and fear that lies behind hostile racial stereotyping. But they reject this speech-protective argument, stating that "it is offered blandly, virtually as an article of faith" by those "in a position of power" who "rarely offer empirical proof of their claims. ,,52 The authors argue that talking back in a close confrontation could be physically dangerous, is unlikely to persuade the racist speaker to reform his views, and is impossible "when racist remarks are delivered in a cowardly fashion, by means of graffiti scrawled on a campus wall late at night or on a poster placed outside of a black student's dormitory door." 53 They also complain that "[e]ven when successful, talking back is a burden" that minority undergraduates 54 should not be forced to assume. In rejecting the counterspeech argument, however, Delgado and Yun cast the argument in its weakest possible form, creating an easy target for relatively summary dismissal. When the strategies and experiential basis for successful counterspeech are fairly stated, its value is more easily recognized. First, no responsible free speech advocate argues that a target of hate speech should directly talk back to a racist speaker in circumstances that quickly could lead to a physical altercation. If one or more hateful speakers closely confronts a member of a minority group with racial epithets or other hostile remarks in circumstances that lead the target of the speech to reasonably fear for her safety, in most circumstances she should seek assistance from campus police or other administrators before "talking back." Even staunch proponents of free speech agree that such threatening speech and conduct is subject to regulation and justifies more than a purely educative response. The same would be true of Delgado's and Yun's other examples of speech conveyed in a manner that defaces another's property or 56 When offensive or hateful speech is not threatening, damaging, or impermissibly invasive and therefore may constitute protected speech, 57 education and counterspeech often will be an appropriate response. However, proponents of free speech do not contemplate that counterspeech always, or even normally, will be in the form of an immediate exchange of views between the hateful speaker and his target. Nor do they contemplate that the target should bear the full burden of the response. Instead, effective counterspeech often takes the form of letters, discussions, or demonstrations joined in by many persons and aimed at the entire campus population or a community within it. Typically, it is designed to expose the moral bankruptcy of the hateful ideas, to demonstrate the strength of opinion and numbers of those who deplore the hateful speech, and to spur members of the campus community to take voluntary, constructive action to combat hate and to remedy its ill effects. 58 Above all, it can serve to define and underscore the community of support enjoyed by the targets of the hateful speech, faith in which may have been shaken by the hateful speech. Moreover, having triggered such a reaction with their own voices, the targets of the hateful speech may well feel a sense of empowerment to compensate for the undeniable pain of the speech. 59 One may be tempted to join Delgado and Yun in characterizing such a scenario as one "offered blandly, virtually as an article of faith" and without experiential support. 6° However, campus communities that have creatively used this approach can attest to the surprising power of counterspeech. Examples of counterspeech to hateful racist and homophobic speech at Arizona State and Stanford Universities are especially illustrative.61 In an incident that attracted national attention, the campus community at Arizona State University ("A.S.U.") constructively and constitutionally responded to a racist poster displayed on the outside of the speaker's dormitory door in February 1991. Entitled "WORK APPLICATION," it contained a number of ostensibly employment-related questions that advanced hostile and demeaning racial stereotypes of African-Americans and Mexican-Americans. Carla Washington, one of a group of African- American women who found the poster, used her own speech to persuade a resident of the offending room voluntarily to take the poster down and allow her to photocopy it. After sending a copy of the poster to the campus newspaper along with an opinion letter deploring its racist stereotypes, she demanded action from the director of her residence hall. The director organized an immediate meeting of the dormitory residents to discuss the issues. In this meeting, I explained why the poster was protected by the First Amendment, and the women who found the poster eloquently described their pain and fears. One of the women, Nichet Smith, voiced her fear that all nonminorities on campus shared the hostile stereotypes expressed in the poster. Dozens of residents expressed their support and gave assurances that they did not share the hostile stereotypes, but they conceded that even the most tolerant among them knew little about the cultures of others and would 62 benefit greatly from multicultural education.  The need for multicultural education to combat intercultural ignorance and stereotyping became the theme of a press conference and public rally organized by the student African-American Coalition leader, Rossie Turman, who opted for highly visible counterspeech despite demands from some students and staff to discipline the owner of the offending poster. The result was a series of opinion letters in the campus newspaper discussing the problem of racism, numerous workshops on race relations and free speech, and overwhelming approval in the Faculty Senate of a measure to add a course on American cultural diversity to the undergraduate breadth 63 requirement.  The four women who initially confronted the racist poster were empowered by the meeting at the dormitory residence and later received awards from the local chapter of the NAACP for their activism.64 Rossie Turman was rewarded for his leadership skills two years later by becoming the first African-American elected President of Associated Students of A.S.U.,65 a student body that numbered approximately 40,000 students, only 66 2.3 percent of them African-American. Although Delgado and Yun are quite right that the African-American students should never have been burdened with the need to respond to such hateful speech, Hentoff is correct that the responses just described helped them develop a sense of self-reliance and constructive activism. Moreover, the students' counterspeech inspired a community response that lightened the students' burden and provided them with a sense of community support and empowerment. Indeed, the students received assistance from faculty and administrators, who helped organize meetings, wrote opinion letters, spoke before the Faculty Senate, or joined the students in issuing public statements at the press conference and public rally.67 Perhaps most important, campus administrators wisely refrained from disciplining the owners of the poster, thus directing public attention to the issue of racism and ensuring broad community support in denouncing the racist poster. Many members of the campus and surrounding communities might have leapt to the racist speaker's defense had the state attempted to discipline the speaker and thus had created a First Amendment issue. Instead, they remained united with the offended students because the glare of the public spotlight remained sharply focused on the racist incident without the distraction of cries of state censorship. Although the counterspeech was not aimed primarily at influencing the hearts and minds of the residents of the offending dormitory room, its vigor in fact caught the residents by surprise. 68 It prompted at least three of them to apologize publicly and to display curiosity about a civil rights movement that they were too young to have witnessed first hand. 69 This effective use of education and counterspeech is not an isolated instance at A.S.U., but has been repeated on several occasions, albeit on smaller scales.7° One year after the counterspeech at A.S.U., Stanford University responded similarly to homophobic speech. In that case, a first-year law student sought to attract disciplinary proceedings and thus gain First Amendment martyrdom by shouting hateful homophobic statements about a dormitory staff member. The dean of students stated that the speaker was not subject to discipline under Stanford's code of conduct but called on the university community to speak out on the issue, triggering an avalanche of counterspeech. Students, staff, faculty, and administrators expressed their opinions in letters to the campus newspaper, in comments on a poster board at the law school, in a published petition signed by 400 members of the law school community disassociating the law school from the speaker's epithets, and in a letter written by several law students reporting the incident to a prospective employer of the offending student.71 The purveyor of hate speech indeed had made a point about the power of speech, just not the one he had intended. He had welcomed disciplinary sanctions as a form of empowerment, but the Stanford community was alert enough to catch his verbal hardball and throw it back with ten times the force. Thus, the argument that counterspeech is preferable to state suppression of offensive speech is stronger and more fully supported by experience than is conceded by Delgado and Yun. In both of the cases described above, the targets of hateful speech were supported by a community united against bigotry. The community avoided splitting into factions because the universities eliminated the issue of censorship by quickly announcing that the hateful speakers were protected from disciplinary retaliation. Indeed, the counterspeech against the bigotry was so powerful in each case that it underscored the need for top administrators to develop standards for, and some limitations on, their participation in such partisan speech. 72 Of course, the community action in these cases was effective and empowering precisely because a community against bigotry existed. At A.S.U. and Stanford, as at most universities, the overwhelming majority of students, faculty, and staff are persons of tolerance and good will who deplore at least the clearest forms of bigotry and are ready to speak out Of course, the community action in these cases was effective and empowering precisely because a community against bigotry existed. At A.S.U. and Stanford, as at most universities, the overwhelming majority of students, faculty, and staff are persons of tolerance and good will who deplore at least the clearest forms of bigotry and are ready to speak out against intolerance when it is isolated as an issue rather than diluted in muddied waters along with concerns of censorship. Just as the nonviolent demonstrations of Martin Luther King, Jr., depended partly for their success on the consciences of the national and international audiences monitoring the fire hoses and attack dogs on their television sets and in the print media,73 the empowerment of the targets of hateful speech rests partly in the hands of members of the campus community who sympathize with them. One can hope that the counterspeech and educational measures used with success at A.S.U. and Stanford stand a good chance of preserving an atmosphere of civility in intellectual inquiry at any campus community in which compassionate, open minds predominate. On the other hand, counterspeech by the targets of hate speech could be less empowering on a campus in which the majority of students, faculty, and staff approve of hostile epithets directed toward members of minority groups. One hopes that such campuses are exceedingly rare; although hostile racial stereotyping among college students in the United States increased during the last decade, those students who harbored significant hostilities (as contrasted with more pervasive but less openly hostile, subconscious racism) still represented a modest fraction of all students.74 Moreover, even in a pervasively hostile atmosphere, counterspeech might still be more effective than broad restrictions on speech. First, aside from the constitutional constraints of the First Amendment, such a heartless campus community would be exceedingly unlikely to adopt strong policies prohibiting hateful speech. Instead, the campus likely would maintain minimum policies necessary to avoid legal action enforcing guarantees of equal educational opportunities under the Fourteenth Amendment 75 or federal antidiscrimination statutes such as Title V176 or Title IX. 77 Second, counterspeech even from a minority of members of the campus community might be effective to gradually build support by winning converts from those straddling the fence or from broader regional or national audiences. Such counterspeech might be particularly effective if coupled with threats from diverse faculty, staff, and students to leave the university for more hospitable environments; even a campus with high levels of hostility likely would feel 78 pressures to maintain its status as a minimally integrated institution. The A.S.U. and Stanford examples illustrating the efficacy of counterspeech also lend support to the argument that "[firee speech has been minorities' best friend ...[as] a principal instrument of social reform."79 In both cases, demonstrations, opinion letters, and other forms of counterspeech dramatically defined the predominant atmosphere on each campus as one that demanded respect and freedom from bigotry for all members of the community; it is doubtful that passage of a speech-restrictive policy could have sent a similar message of consensus any more strongly. Moreover, in the A.S.U. case, the reasoned counterspeech, coupled with the decision to refrain from disciplining the hateful speaker, persuaded the Faculty Senate to pass a multicultural education proposal whose chances for passage were seriously in doubt in the previous weeks and months.8 The racist poster at A.S.U. may have been a blessing in disguise, albeit an initially painful one, because it sparked counterspeech and community action that strengthened the campus support for diversity.

#### Student bodies are essential flashpoints to create social change- they are diverse classes that foster difference

**Delgado 15** [Delgado, Sandra. “The Pedagogical Potential of Student Collective Action in the Age of the Corporate University” (Doctoral Student in curriculum studies at the university of british Columbia). Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy. University of British Columbia. 2015] NB

During the last decade students have played a prominent role, as part of the many resistance efforts against the privatization of the university. They have organized massive movements, occupied campuses and buildings, and they have made extraordinary and creative demonstrations to raise the public’s awareness about the consequences of the corporatization of higher education (Hill, 2013). Among the most popular and studied movements of the decade are the ones that took place in 2011 in Chile (Salinas & Fraser, 2012; Somma, 2012) and 2010 in England (Ibrahim, 2011). In these cases, students not only organized unprecedented large marches and public demonstrations, but also they inspired many subsequent national and transnational movements. As students’ collective actions keep gaining more political relevance, student and university movements also establish themselves as spaces of counter-hegemony (Sotiris, 2014). Students are constantly opening new possibilities to displace and resist the commodification of education offered by mainstream educational institutions. As Sotiris (2014) convincingly argues, movements within the university have not only the potential to subvert educational reforms, but in addition, they have become “strategic nodes” for the transformation of the processes and practices in higher education, and most importantly for the constant re-imagination and the recreation of “new forms of subaltern counter-hegemony” (p. 1). The strategic importance of university and college based moments lays precisely in the role that higher education plays in contemporary societies, namely their role in “the development of new technologies, new forms of production and for the articulation of discourses and theories on contemporary issues and their role in the reproduction of state and business personnel.” (p.8) Universities and colleges therefore, have a crucial contribution in “the development of class strategies (both dominant and subaltern), in the production of subjectivities, (and) in the transformation of collective practices” (p.8) The main objective of this paper is to examine how contemporary student movements are disrupting, opposing and displacing entrenched oppressive and dehumanizing reforms, practices and frames in today’s corporate academia. This work is divided in four sections. The first is an introduction to student movements and an overview of how student political action has been approached and researched. The second and third sections take a closer look at the repertoires of contention used by contemporary student movements and propose a framework based on radical praxis that allows us to better understand the pedagogical potential of student disruptive action. The last section contains a series of examples of students’ repertoires or tactics of contention that exemplifies the pedagogical potential of student social and political action. Generally speaking, students are well positioned as political actors. They have been actively involved in the politics of education since the beginnings of the university, but more broadly, students have played a significant role in defining social, cultural and political environments around the world (Altbach, 1966; Boren, 2001). The contributions and influences of students and student movements to revolutionary efforts and political movements beyond the university context are undeniable. One example is the role that students have played in the leadership and membership of the political left (e.g. students’ role in the Movimiento 26 de Julio - M-26-7 in Cuba during the 50’s and in the formation of The New Left in the United States, among others). Similarly, several political and social movements have either established alliances with student organizations or created their own chapters on campuses to recruit new members, mobilize their agendas in education and foster earlier student’s involvement in politics2 (Altbach, 1966; Lipset, 1969). Students are often considered to be “catalysts” of political and social action or “barometers” of the social unrest and political tension accumulated in society (Barker, 2008). Throughout history student movements have had a diverse and sometimes contradictory range of political commitments. Usually, student organizations and movements find grounding and inspiration in Anarchism and Marxism, however it is also common to see movements leaning towards liberal and conservative approaches. Hence, student political action has not always been aligned with social movements or organizations from the political left. In various moments in history students have joined or been linked to rightist movements, reactionary organizations and conservative parties (Altbach, 1966; Barker, 2008). Students, unlike workers, come from different social classes and seemly different cultural backgrounds. As a particularly diverse social group, students are distinguished for being heterogeneous and pluralists in their values, interests and commitments (Boren, 2001). Such diversity has been a constant challenge for maintaining unity, which has been particularly problematic in cases of national or transnational student organizations (Prusinowska, Kowzan, & Zielińska, 2012; Somma, 2012). To clarify, social classes are defined by the specific relationship that people have with the means of production. In the case of students, they are not a social class by themselves, but a social layer or social group that is identifiable by their common function in society (Stedman, 1969). The main or central aspect that unites student is the transitory social condition of being a student. In other words, students are a social group who have a common function, role in society or social objective, which is “to study” something (Lewis, 2013; Simons & Masschelein, 2009). Student movements can be understood as a form of social movement (Luesher- Mamashela, 2015). They have an internal organization that varies from traditionally hierarchical structures, organizational schemes based on representative democracy with charismatic leadership, to horizontal forms of decision-making (Altbach, 1966; Lipset, 1969). As many other movements, student movements have standing claims, organize different type of actions, tactics or repertoires of contention,3 and they advocate for political, social or/and educational agendas, programs or pleas. Student political activity has been studied by scholars in social movements, youth activism, communication, anthropology, sociology and history. Outside of mainstream academic publishing, activists and militants have also contributed to document experiences of student activism by writing booklets, autobiographies, weblogs, music and poetry (e.g. from Goliardic poetry in medieval Europe to contemporary song writing). Some activists have also registered their experiences and perspectives in storied form and their work can be found as part of the literary genre.4

## 1AC- Generic- V1

### Framing

#### Neoliberalism has infilitrated the academy and our every-day lives. Objectivity is a lie- ethical standpoints have been constructed by neoliberalism and are used to shield true oppression. Neoliberalism has coopted everything we know while sacrificing the academy and higher education as a site for critical dialogue. The role of the ballot is to assume the role of an academic fighting neoliberalism through the post-fiat consequences of governmental policy.

**Giroux 13** [Henry A. Giroux (McMaster Univeristy Professor for Scholarship in Public Interest and the Paulo Freire Distingusiehd Scholar in Critical Pedagogy”, 10-29-2013, "Henry A. Giroux," Truthout, <http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university>] NB

And while Lourde refers to poetry here, I think a strong case can be made that the attributes she ascribes to poetry can also be attributed  to higher education - a genuine higher education.[2](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university#II)  In this case, an education that includes history, philosophy, all of the arts and humanities, the criticality of the social sciences, the world of discovery made manifest by science, and the transformations in health and in law wrought by the professions that are fundamental to what it means to know something about the human condition. Lourde's defense of poetry as a mode of education is especially crucial for those of us who believe that the university is nothing if it is not a public trust and social good; that is a critical institution infused with the promise of cultivating intellectual insight, the imagination, inquisitiveness, risk-taking, social responsibility and the struggle for justice. At best, universities should be at the "heart of intense public discourse, passionate learning and vocal citizen involvement in the issues of the times."[3](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university#NA) It is in the spirit of such an ideal that I first want to address those larger economic, social, and cultural interests that threaten this notion of education, especially higher education. Across the globe, the forces of casino capitalism are on the march. With the return of the Gilded Age and its dream worlds of consumption, privatization and deregulation, not only are democratic values and social protections at risk, but the civic and formative cultures that make such values and protections crucial to democratic life are in danger of disappearing altogether.  As public spheres, once enlivened by broad engagements with common concerns, are being transformed into "spectacular spaces of consumption," the flight from mutual obligations and social responsibilities intensifies and has resulted in what Tony Judt identifies as a "loss of faith in the culture of open democracy."[4](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university#III) This loss of faith in the power of public dialogue and dissent is not unrelated to the diminished belief in higher education as central to producing critical citizens and a crucial democratic public sphere in its own right. At stake here is not only the meaning and purpose of higher education, but also civil society, politics and the fate of democracy itself. Thomas Frank is on target when he argues that "Over the course of the past few decades, the power of concentrated money has subverted professions, destroyed small investors, wrecked the regulatory state, corrupted legislators en masse and repeatedly put the economy through the wringer. Now it has come for our democracy itself."[5](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university#IV) And, yet, the only questions being asked about knowledge production, the purpose of education, the nature of politics, and our understanding of the future are determined largely by market forces. The mantras of neoliberalism are now well known: Government is the problem; Society is a fiction; Sovereignty is market-driven; Deregulation and commodification are vehicles for freedom; and Higher education should serve corporate interests rather than the public good. In addition, the yardstick of profit has become the only viable measure of the good life, while civic engagement and public spheres devoted to the common good are viewed by many politicians and their publics as either a hindrance to the goals of a market-driven society or alibis for government inefficiency and waste. In a market-driven system in which economic and political decisions are removed from social costs, the flight of critical thought and social responsibility is further accentuated by what Zygmunt Bauman calls "ethical tranquillization."[6](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university#V) One result is a form of depoliticization that works its way through the social order, removing social relations from the configurations of power that shape them, substituting what Wendy Brown calls "emotional and personal vocabularies for political ones in formulating solutions to political problems." Consequently, it becomes difficult for young people too often bereft of a critical education to translate private troubles into public concerns. As private interests trump the public good, public spaces are corroded, and short-term personal advantage replaces any larger notion of civic engagement and social responsibility.   Under such circumstances, to cite C. W. Mills, we are witnessing the breakdown of democracy, the disappearance of critical intellectuals and "the collapse of those public spheres which offer a sense of critical agency and social imagination."[8](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university#VII)   Mill's prescient comments amplify what has become a tragic reality. Missing from neoliberal market societies are those public spheres - from public and higher education to the mainstream media and digital screen culture - where people can develop what might be called the civic imagination. For example, in the last few decades, we have seen market mentalities attempt to strip education of its public values, critical content and civic responsibilities as part of its broader goal of creating new subjects wedded to consumerism, risk-free relationships and the disappearance of the social state in the name of individual, expanded choice.  Tied largely to instrumental ideologies and measurable paradigms, many institutions of higher education are now committed almost exclusively to economic goals, such as preparing students for the workforce - all done as part of an appeal to rationality, one that eschews matters of inequality, power and the ethical grammars of suffering.[9](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university#VIII)  Many universities have not only strayed from their democratic mission, they also seem immune to the plight of students who face a harsh new world of high unemployment, the prospect of downward mobility and debilitating debt. The question of what kind of education is needed for students to be informed and active citizens in a world that increasingly ignores their needs, if not their future, is rarely asked.[10](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university#IX) In the absence of a democratic vision of schooling, it is not surprising that some colleges and universities are increasingly opening their classrooms to corporate interests, standardizing the curriculum, instituting top-down governing structures, and generating courses that promote entrepreneurial values unfettered by social concerns or ethical consequences. For example, one university is offering a master's degree to students who, in order to fulfill their academic requirements, have to commit to starting a high-tech company. Another university allows career officers to teach capstone research seminars in the humanities. In one of these classes, the students were asked to "develop a 30-second commercial on their 'personal brand.' "[11](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university#X) This is not an argument against career counseling or research in humanities seminars, but the confusion in collapsing the two. Central to this neoliberal view of higher education in the United States and United Kingdom is a market-driven paradigm that seeks to eliminate tenure, turn the humanities into a job preparation service, and transform most faculty into an army of temporary subaltern labor For instance, in the United States out of 1.5 million faculty members, 1 million are "adjuncts who are earning, on average, $20,000 a year gross, with no benefits or healthcare, no unemployment insurance when they are out of work."[12](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university#XI) The indentured service status of such faculty is put on full display as some colleges have resorted to using "temporary service agencies to do their formal hiring."[13](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university#XII) There is little talk in this view of higher education about the history and value of shared governance between faculty and administrators, nor of educating students as critical citizens rather than potential employees of Walmart. There are few attempts to affirm faculty as scholars and public intellectuals who have both a measure of autonomy and power. Instead, faculty members are increasingly defined less as intellectuals than as technicians and grant writers. Students fare no better in this debased form of education and are treated as either clients or as restless children in need of high-energy entertainment - as was made clear in the 2012 Penn State scandal. Such modes of education do not foster a sense of organized responsibility fundamental to a democracy. Instead, they encourage what might be called a sense of organized irresponsibility - a practice that underlies the economic Darwinism and civic corruption at the heart of a debased politics.

#### Modern oppression and institutionalized violence are a result of political ignorance, isolationism, and egoism that makes minorities disposable

**Giroux 13** [Giroux, Henry. "Violence Is Deeply Rooted in American Culture:." Leolienne. N.p., 13 Jan. 2013. Web. <http://www.leolienne.com/bamablog/index.php/categories/28-learning/essatorials/1158-henry-giroux-violence-deeply-routed-in-american-culture>.] KB access 12/1/15

In the US there is an institutionalized regime of neoliberal violence directed against low income people, poor minorities, immigrants, the disabled, and others now considered disposable under a ruthless and savage fanatical capitalism that luxuriates in the poisonous dream worlds of commodification, deregulation, consumption, and privatization. Within this regime of neoliberal violence, the politics of disposability is shored up by the assumption that some lives and social relationships are not worthy of a meaningful social existence, empathy and social protections. For instance, those considered “other” because of their lack of capital, consuming power, or alleged refusal to accept the unethical grammar of an Atlas Shrugged winner-take-all ethos are now relegated to zones of abandonment and terminal exclusion. Lacking social protections, such populations increasingly are addressed within the growing reach of the punishing state, as a source of entertainment, or are relegated to what the French philosopher Etienne Balibar calls the "death zones of humanity."[6] In a culture defined by excessive inequality, suffering, and cruelty, the protective covering of the state, along with the public values and the formative culture necessary for a democracy is corrupted, increasingly dismantled, and held in contempt. And the disposable are not merely those populations caught in extreme poverty. Increasingly, they are individuals and groups now ravaged by bad mortgages, poor credit and huge debt. They are the growing army of the unemployed forced to abandon their houses, credit cards and ability to consume -- a liability that pushes them to the margins of a market society. These are the groups whose homes will not be covered by insurance, who have no place to live, no resources to fall back on, no way to imagine that the problems they will be facing are not just personal, but deeply structural, built into a system that views the social contract and the welfare state as a lethal disease. In this economic Darwinist measure of value, those marginalized by race and class, who might detract from, rather than enlarge another's wealth are not only demonized, but are also viewed as problematic in that they become burdens to be disposed of, rather than a valuable and treasured human resource in which to invest. The discourse of disposability is not limited to right-wing politicians, but it is also built into the vocabulary of neoliberal governmental policy. Market societies are ruled by a predatory form of economic Darwinism in which greed and avarice are legitimated through a war-against-all, survival-of-the-fittest mentality that embraces a near sociopathic lack of interest in others and provides few social protections against individual and collective misfortune while at the same time dismissing the value of social provisions. As the sociologist Elliott Currie has pointed out, neoliberal societies have become criminogenic in that they destroy peoples’ livelihoods, withdraw public supports, create massive extremes of economic inequality, erode social bonds while creating debilitating forms of atomization, promote materialistic values that produce a culture of callousness, corrupt the political process, and market a form of normalized brutality evident in the massive rise of corporate crime and a culture of corruption.[7] Neoliberalism represents a full-fledged assault on democratic values, relations, and public spheres and does so by universalizing its own ideology, policies, and modes of governance. Its logic of disposability reduces citizenship to the logic of consumerism, reinforces the dominance of public life by giant corporations, and produces what the anthropologist Joao Biel calls a “machinery of social death.” In fact, the “machinery of social death,” is fed by corporate investments in the organized production of violence for profit and I am not just talking about industries that make big profits as part of the military-industrial complex. As New York Times journalist Andrew Ross Sorkin states, what has been overlooked in the recent debate about gun worship in the United States is that some of the biggest gun makers are “owned by private equity funds run by Wall Street titan.” For instance, Cerberus Capital Management, Sciens Capital Management, and MidOcean Partners make big profits selling everything from Ak-47s to military-grade night-vision goggles.[8] The technology of death is a big profit maker for Wall Street and makes clear that neoliberalism is actively engaged in the production of a dystopian society in which people, resources, and goods are now considered throwaways, just as moral responsibility is detached from actions, and politics is removed from the promise of a substantive democracy.

#### Neolib produced international conflicts and collapses the environment- results in extinction

**Ehrenfeld 05** (David, Dept. of Ecology, Evolution, and Natural Resources @ Rutgers University, “The Environmental Limits to Globalization”, Conservation Biology Vol. 19 No. 2 April 2005)

The known effects of globalization on the environment are numerous and highly significant. Many others are undoubtedly unknown. Given these circumstances, the first question that suggests itself is: Will globalization, as we see it now, remain a permanent state of affairs (Rees 2002; Ehrenfeld 2003a)? The principal environmental side effects of globalization—climate change, resource exhaustion (particularly cheap energy), damage to agroecosystems, and the spread of exotic species, including pathogens (plant, animal, and human)—are sufficient to make this economic system unstable and short-lived. The socioeconomic consequences of globalization are likely to do the same. In my book The Arrogance of Humanism (1981), I claimed that our ability to manage global systems, which depends on our being able to predict the results of the things we do, or even to understand the systems we have created, has been greatly exaggerated. Much of our alleged control is science fiction; it doesn’t work because of theoretical limits that we ignore at our peril. We live in a dream world in which reality testing is something we must never, never do, lest we awake. In 1984 Charles Perrow explored the reasons why we have trouble predicting what so many of our own created systems will do, and why they surprise us so unpleasantly while we think we are managing them. In his book Normal Accidents, which does not concern globalization, he listed the critical characteristics of some of today’s complex systems. They are highly interlinked, so a change in one part can affect many others, even those that seem quite distant. Results of some processes feed back on themselves in unexpected ways. The controls of the system often interact with each other unpredictably. We have only indirect ways of finding out what is happening inside the system. And we have an incomplete understanding of some of the system’s processes. His example of such a system is a nuclear power plant, and this, he explained, is why system-wide accidents in nuclear plants cannot be predicted or eliminated by system design. I would argue that globalization is a similar system, also subject to catastrophic accidents, many of them environmental—events that we cannot define until after they have occurred, and perhaps not even then. The comparatively few commentators who have predicted the collapse of globalization have generally given social reasons to support their arguments. These deserve some consideration here, if only because the environmental and social consequences of globalization interact so strongly with each other. In 1998, the British political economist John Gray, giving scant attention to environmental factors, nevertheless came to the conclusion that globalization is unstable and will be short-lived. He said, “There is nothing in today’s global market that buffers it against the social strains arising from highly uneven economic development within and between the world’s diverse societies.” The result, Gray states, is that “The combination of [an] unceasing stream of new technologies, unfettered market competition and weak or fractured social institutions” has weakened both sovereign states and multinational corporations in their ability to control important events. Note that Gray claims that not only nations but also multinational corporations, which are widely touted as controlling the world, are being weakened by globalization. This idea may come as a surprise, considering the growth of multinationals in the past few decades, but I believe it is true. Neither governments nor giant corporations are even remotely capable of controlling the environmental or social forces released by globalization, without first controlling globalization itself. Two of the social critics of globalization with the most dire predictions about its doom are themselves masters of the process. The late Sir James Goldsmith, billionaire financier, wrote in 1994, It must surely be a mistake to adopt an economic policy which makes you rich if you eliminate your national workforce and transfer production abroad, and which bankrupts you if you continue to employ your own people.... It is the poor in the rich countries who will subsidize the rich in the poor countries. This will have a serious impact on the social cohesion of nations. Another free-trade billionaire, George Soros, said much the same thing in 1995: “The collapse of the global marketplace would be a traumatic event with unimaginable consequences. Yet I find it easier to imagine than the continuation of the present regime.” How much more powerful these statements are if we factor in the environment! As globalization collapses, what will happen to people, biodiversity, and ecosystems? With respect to people, the gift of prophecy is not required to answer this question. What will happen depends on where you are and how you live. Many citizens of the Third World are still comparatively self-sufficient; an unknown number of these will survive the breakdown of globalization and its attendant chaos. In the developed world, there are also people with resources of self-sufficiency and a growing understanding of the nature of our social and environmental problems, which may help them bridge the years of crisis. Some species are adaptable; some are not. For the non- human residents of Earth, not all news will be bad. Who would have predicted that wild turkeys (Meleagris gallopavo), one of the wiliest and most evasive of woodland birds, extinct in New Jersey 50 years ago, would now be found in every county of this the most densely populated state, and even, occasionally, in adjacent Manhattan? Who would have predicted that black bears (Ursus americanus), also virtually extinct in the state in the mid-twentieth century, would now number in the thousands (Ehrenfeld 2001)? Of course these recoveries are unusual—rare bright spots in a darker landscape. Finally, a few ecological systems may survive in a comparatively undamaged state; most will be stressed to the breaking point, directly or indirectly, by many environmental and social factors interacting unpredictably. Lady Luck, as always, will have much to say. In his book The Collapse of Complex Societies, the archaeologist Joseph Tainter (1988) notes that collapse, which has happened to al l past empires, inevitably results in human systems of lower complexity and less specialization, less centralized control, lower economic activity, less information flow, lower population levels, less trade, and less redistribution of resources. All of these changes are inimical to globalization. This less-complex, less-globalized condition is probably what human societies will be like when the dust settles. I do not think, however, that we can make such specific predictions about the ultimate state of the environment after globalization, because we have never experienced anything like this exceptionally rapid, global environmental damage before. History and science have little to tell us in this situation. The end of the current economic system and the transition to a postglobalized state is and will be accompanied by a desperate last raid on resources and a chaotic flurry of environmental destruction whose results cannot possibly be told in advance. All one can say is that the surviving species, ecosystems, and resources will be greatly impoverished compared with what we have now, and our descendants will not thank us for having adopted, however briefly, an economic system that consumed their inheritance and damaged their planet so wantonly. Environment is a true bottom line—concern for its condition must trump all purely economic growth strategies if both the developed and developing nations are to survive and prosper. Awareness of the environmental limits that globalized industrial society denies or ignores should not, however, bring us to an extreme position of environmental determinism. Those whose preoccupations with modern civilization’s very real social problems cause them to reject or minimize the environmental constraints discussed here ( Hollander 2003) are guilty of seeing only half the picture. Environmental scientists sometimes fall into the same error. It is tempting to see the salvation of civilization and environment solely in terms of technological improvements in efficiency of energy extraction and use, control of pollution, conservation of water, and regulation of environmentally harmful activities. But such needed developments will not be sufficient—or may not even occur— without corresponding social change, including an end to human population growth and the glorification of consumption, along with the elimination of economic mechanisms that increase the gap between rich and poor. The environmental and social problems inherent in globalization are completely interrelated—any attempt to treat them as separate entities is unlikely to succeed in easing the transition to a postglobalized world. Integrated change that combines environmental awareness, technological innovation, and an altered world view is the only answer to the life-threatening problems exacerbated by globalization (Ehrenfeld 2003b). If such integrated change occurs in time, it will likely happen partly by our own design and partly as an unplanned response to the constraints imposed by social unrest, disease, and the economics of scarcity. With respect to the planned component of change, we are facing, as eloquently described by Rees (2002), “the ultimate challenge to human intelligence and self-awareness, those vital qualities we humans claim as uniquely our own. Homo sapiens will either. . .become fully human or wink out ignominiously, a guttering candle in a violent storm of our own making.” If change does not come quickly, our global civilization will join Tainter’s (1988) list as the latest and most dramatic example of collapsed complex societies. Is there anything that could slow globalization quickly, before it collapses disastrously of its own environmental and social weight? It is still not too late to curtail the use of energy, reinvigorate local and regional communities while restoring a culture of concern for each other, reduce nonessential global trade and especially global finance (Daly & Cobb 1989), do more to control introductions of exotic species (including pathogens), and accelerate the growth of sustainable agriculture. Many of the needed technologies are already in place. It is true that some of the damage to our environment—species extinctions, loss of crop and domestic animal varieties, many exotic species introductions, and some climatic change— will be beyond repair. Nevertheless, the opportunity to help our society move past globalization in an orderly way, while there is time, is worth our most creative and passionate efforts. The citizens of the United States and other nations have to understand that our global economic system has placed both our environment and our society in peril, a peril as great as that posed by any war of the twentieth century. This understanding, and the actions that follow, must come not only from enlightened leadership, but also from grassroots consciousness raising. It is still possible to reclaim the planet from a self-destructive economic system that is bringing us all down together, and this can be a task that bridges the divide between conservatives and liberals. The crisis is here, now. What we have to do has become obvious. Globalization can be scaled back to manageable proportions only in the context of an altered world view that rejects materialism even as it restores a sense of communal obligation. In this way, alone, can we achieve real homeland security, not just in the United States, but also in other nations, whose fates have become so thoroughly entwined with ours within the global environment we share.

### Advantage

#### The alt right is already energized in the status quo- students already engage in harmful dialogue.

**Harkinson 12-6** [Harkinson, Josh. “The Push to Enlist ‘Alt-Right’ Recruits on College Campuses. Dec 6, 2016. <http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2016/12/richard-spencer-alt-right-college-activism>. ]

How much support is there for the loose-knit coalition of white nationalists and other far-right extremists known as [the "alt-right"](http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2016/11/trump-white-nationalists-hate-racism-power" \t "_blank)? Despite a spike in media coverage for the movement in the wake of Donald Trump's victory, a recent conference hosted by white nationalist Richard Spencer, who coined the term "alt-right," drew only about 275 attendees in Washington, DC. And after [a video](http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/11/richard-spencer-speech-npi/508379/" \t "_blank) from the event went viral, showing audience members giving Nazi salutes to Spencer's cry of "hail Trump," the movement faced a fierce backlash. Although Trump named [alt-right hero](http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2016/08/stephen-bannon-donald-trump-alt-right-breitbart-news" \t "_blank) Stephen Bannon as his chief White House strategist, the president-elect went on to disavow the alt-right—in general terms, at least—in an interview with the New York Times. The movement [gained momentum online in 2016](http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2016/11/trump-white-nationalists-hate-racism-power" \t "_blank) but is no longer just [about social media](http://www.demographicspro.com/insights/trump-supporters-follow-white-nationalists-on-twitter" \t "_blank), says Spencer; he sees a need to prove that the alt-right can attract supporters in the real world. And he says the best place to do that is on college campuses, starting with a speech he plans to deliver on Tuesday on the campus of Texas A&M University. "People in college are at this point in their lives where they are actually open to alternative perspectives, for better and for worse," Spencer says. "I think you do need to get them while they are young. I think rewiring the neurons of someone over 50 is effectively impossible." Recruiting on college campuses has long been a goal for "academic racists" such as Jared Taylor and Peter Brimelow, a white nationalist whom Spencer helped bring to Duke University for an event in 2007, [when Spencer was a student there](http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2016/10/richard-spencer-trump-alt-right-white-nationalist" \t "_blank). In May, Spencer and other white nationalists set up a "safe space" on the University of California-Berkeley's Sproul Plaza to discuss "how race affects people of European heritage." He claims that he will be giving two more speeches about the alt-right at universities in California. "The left just owns academia through and through," Spencer says, "so I think it is important to go to the belly of the beast and not let them own it." In recent months, Breitbart News pundit Milo Yiannopoulos' "Dangerous Faggot Tour" drew crowds at college campuses around the country. Several colleges canceled scheduled talks by Yiannopoulos because of "security concerns." Yiannopoulos does not label himself "alt-right" but has characterized the movement as a legitimate response to political correctness. He often describes white males as victims of "reverse discrimination" and speaks euphemistically of defending "Western values." [A talk that he gave on the alt-right](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-7-dAmdy-JE" \t "_blank) at the University of Houston in September drew cheers and a chant invoking the name of the alt-right mascot Pepe the Frog. "That was a revelation for me," Spencer said about Yiannopoulos' talk. "What we are doing is known to people, it's edgy and dangerous, it's cool and hip. It's that thing our parents don't want us to do. So that was definitely a huge inspiration." University campuses historically have incubated a range of social movements, from Marxism to multiculturalism on the left to right-wing movements such as neoliberalism and fascism, including [Nazism in Germany](https://www.facinghistory.org/holocaust-and-human-behavior/chapter-5/controlling-universities" \t "_blank) ([and in the United States](https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2009/06/17/nazism" \t "_blank)).

#### Corporate agencies and military funds universities to push students into helping the regime

**Giroux 12** [Giroux, H. (2012). The Post-9/11 Militarization of Higher Education and the Popular Culture of Depravity: Threats to the Future of American Democracy. International Journal of Sociology of Education, 1(1), 27-53. doi: 10.4471/rise.2012.02 ] NB

Since the tragic events of 9/11, state-sanctioned violence and the formative culture that makes it possible has increasingly made its way into higher education. While there is a long history of higher education taking on research funds and projects that serve the military-industrial complex, such projects were often hidden from public view. When they did become public, they were often the object of student protests and opposition, especially during the 1960s. What is new today is that more research projects in higher education than ever before are being funded by various branches of the military, but either no one is paying attention or no one seems to care about such projects. Ethical and political considerations about the role of the university in a demo- cratic society have given way to a hyper-pragmatism couched in the lan guage of austerity and largely driven by a decrease in state funding for higher education and the dire lack of jobs for many graduates. It is also driven by a market-centered ethos that celebrates a militant form of in- dividualism, a survivalist ethic, a crass emphasis on materialism, and an utter disregard for the responsibility of others. As research funds dry up for programs aimed at addressing crucial social problems, new oppor- tunities open up with the glut of military funding aimed at creating more sophisticated weapons, surveillance technologies, and modes of knowl- edge that connect anthropological concerns with winning wars. Higher education should be one place where young people learn to question the framing mechanisms that allow them both to be turned into producers and consumers of violence and to become increasingly indif- ferent to matters of social and moral responsibility. Military modes of education largely driven by the demands of war and organized violence are investing heavily in pedagogical practices that train students in var- ious intelligence operations. Programs such as the Pat Roberts Intelli- gence Scholars Program and the Intelligence Community Scholarship Programs disregard the principles of academic freedom and recruit stu- dents to serve in a number of intelligence agencies, such as the CIA, which have a long history of using torture, assassinations, and illegal prisons, and on occasion committing domestic atrocities—such as spy- -ing on Juan Cole, a prominent academic and critic of the Iraq War (Zw- erling 2011). The increasingly intensified and expansive symbiosis be- tween the military-industrial complex and academia is also on full display the creation of the “Minerva Consortium,” ironically named after the goddess of wisdom, whose purpose is to fund various universities to “carry out social sciences research relevant to national security” (Brainard, 2008). As David Price (2010) has brilliantly documented, the CIA and other intelligence agencies “today sneak unidentified students with undisclosed links to intelligence agencies into university class- rooms. A new generation of so-called flagship programs have quietly taken root on campuses, and, with each new flagship, our universities are transformed into vessels of the militarized state.” As Price (2011) points out, not only is knowledge militarized, but specific disciplines such a anthropology are now weaponized. The Pentagon’s desire to turn universities into militarized knowledge factories producing knowledge, research, and personnel in the interest of the Homeland (In)Security State should be of special concern for intellectuals, artists, academics, and oth- ers who believe that the university should oppose such interests and alignments. Connecting universities with any one of the 16 U.S. security and intelligence agencies replaces the ideal of educating students to be critical citizens with the notion of students as potential spies and citizen soldiers (Price, 2009). Pedagogy, in this instance becomes militarized.

#### Education is increasingly driven by neoliberal forces – student activism is key to retake the political sphere.

**Williams 15** [Jo Williams (Lecturer, College of Education at Victoria University), "Remaking education from below: the Chilean student movement as public pedagogy," Australian Journal of Adult Learning, November 2015]

More than ever the crisis of schooling represents, at large, the crisis of democracy itself and any attempt to understand the attack on public schooling and higher education cannot be separated from the wider assault on all forms of public life not driven by the logic of the market (Giroux, 2003:7) “Fin al lucro en educación, nuestros sueños no les pertenecen” (end profit making in education, nobody owns our dreams 1 ) (slogan of the Chilean student movement, inspired by the French student uprisings of May-June 1968) Over the past four decades, as the economic and ideological depravity of neoliberal policy and its market-driven logic (D. W. Hursh & Henderson, 2011) has been brought to bear on every aspect of education, the very concept of ‘public’ has been negated. Characteristics such as user-pays, competition, assaults on teachers, and mass standardised-testing and rankings, are among the features of a schooling, which is now very much seen as a private rather than public good (Giroux, 2003). The question of public education as a democratic force for the radical transformation of a violently unjust society seems rarely if ever asked, and a dangerous co-option and weakening of the language and practice of progressive pedagogy has occurred to the extent that notions of inclusion and success are increasingly limited to narrowly conceived individualist and competitive measures of market advantage. As Giroux notes “the forces of neo-liberalism dissolve public issues into utterly privatised and individualistic concerns (2004:62), and despite ongoing official rhetoric “the only form of citizenship increasingly being offered to young people is consumerism” (2003:7). Neoliberal education sees students and young people as passive consumers, the emphasis of schooling on learning how to be governed rather than how to govern (Giroux, 2003:7). In such a context the space for a public pedagogy, based on challenging the hegemony of neoliberal ideology and aligned with collective resistance, appears limited at best. And yet, every day people, teachers, students and communities do engage in political struggle, enacting pedagogies that seek to unveil rather than continue to mask the political structures and organisation that ensures power remains in the hands of the few, and at the service of the few, at the expense of the rest of us. Giroux characterises public pedagogies as defined by hope, struggle and a politicisation of the education process. He argues for …a politics of resistance that extends beyond the classroom as part of a broader struggle to challenge those forces of neo-liberalism that currently wage war against all collective structures capable of defending vital social institutions as a public good (Giroux, 2003:14). Central to Giroux’s argument is the need for critical educators to look to, value, and engage in and with social movements as they emerge and develop as sites of resistance. To …take sides, speak out, and engage in the hard work of debunking corporate culture’s assault on teaching and learning, orient their teaching for social change, connect learning to public life [and] link knowledge to the operations of power (Giroux, 2004:77). He argues that “[p]rogressive education in an age of rampant neoliberalism requires an expanded notion of the public, pedagogy, solidarity, and democratic struggle” (Giroux, 2003:13), and that moreover, educators need to work against a “politics of certainty” and instead develop and engage in pedagogical practice that problematises the world and fosters a sense of collective resistance and hope (2003:14). A neoliberal vision of the ‘good citizen’ and ‘good student’ presumes passivity, acceptance of the status quo and an individualistic disposition. Critical pedagogues must seek out and embrace opportunities to support and celebrate collective political action, not only because it develops a sense of social and political agency but also because it constitutes a powerful basis for authentic learning and active and critical citizenship in an unjust world (Freire, 1970). The Chilean student movement stands as one such example of challenging and inspiring counter-practice and a reclaiming of pedagogy as political and public. For ten years students have filled Chile’s streets, occupied their schools and universities, and organised conferences, public Remaking education from below: the Chilean student movement as public pedagogy 499 meetings, political stunts, creative actions and protests. Students and young people have been at the centre of the largest and most sustained political action seen in Chile since the democratic movement of the 80s, which eventually forced out the Pinochet dictatorship. Despite global trends in the opposite direction, the Chilean students have fundamentally influenced a nationwide education reform program constituting significant changes to the existing system which has been described as an extreme example of market-driven policy (Valenzuela, Bellei, & Ríos, 2014:220). Most importantly, they have forced and led a nationwide dialogue on the question of education and social justice in Chile and an interrogation of the current, grossly inequitable and elitist model (Falabella, 2008). This article begins by reviewing the experiences of the Chilean student movement to date and offering a brief explanation of the historical development of the education system it seeks to dismantle. It then considers the movement as an example of public pedagogies, concluding with a discussion of how it might inform notions of radical educational practice and a return of the student and pedagogue as authentic and critical subjects.

#### Universities currently restrict free speech- that stifles protests and key intellectual discussion necessary for progressivism

**Maloney 16** [Cliff Maloney, Jr., Oct 13, 2016, "Colleges Have No Right to Limit Students' Free Speech," TIME, <http://time.com/4530197/college-free-speech-zone/>] NB

In grade school, I learned that debate is defined as “a discussion between people in which they express different opinions about something.” Such open discourse was historically encouraged on our college campuses. Universities exemplified intellectual discussion and debate in America. [No one voiced their opinions louder](http://time.com/4106357/student-protest-1970-2015/) than students, professors and administrators. They pushed society’s limits by admitting women and people of color, and by encouraging [diversity of thought](http://time.com/3890722/the-silencing-college/) amongst the [college community](http://time.com/4347099/college-campus-protests/). Historically, young people flocked to universities to learn more about the world around them, to encounter people from different backgrounds, to expand their minds and to form their own opinions. Unfortunately, things have changed. Recently on college campuses, our open discourse has been threatened, particularly when discussing politics. While the current presidential election represents polarizing wings of both the Democratic and Republican parties, we should be able to openly debate their policies and the direction in which they plan to take our country if elected. We should be able to discuss the abuse of power within our government and the consistent violations of our Bill of Rights. We should be able to participate in the free market of ideas. But our students are being silenced. University campuses are now home to a plethora of speech restrictions. From [sidewalk-sized “free-speech zones”](http://www.forbes.com/sites/realspin/2013/09/13/how-one-college-student-fought-his-schools-free-speech-zone-and-won/" \t "_blank) to the criminalization of [microaggressions](http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2016/09/colleges-are-defining-microaggressions-really-broadly.html" \t "_blank), America’s college campuses look and feel a lot more like an authoritarian dictatorship than they do the academic hubs of the modern free world. When rolling an inflated free-speech ball around campus, students at the University of Delaware were [halted by campus police](http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/07/education/edlife/constitution-free-speech-first-amendment.html?_r=0" \t "_blank) for their activities. A Young Americans for Liberty leader at Fairmont State University in West Virginia [was confronted by security](http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2016/sep/15/fairmont-state-university-wva-halts-conservative-c/" \t "_blank) when he was attempting to speak with other students about the ideas he believes in. A man at Clemson University was [barred from praying on campus](http://www.charlotteobserver.com/news/state/south-carolina/article98993982.html" \t "_blank) because he was outside of the free-speech zone. And a student at Blinn College in Texas [abolished her campus’ free-speech zone](http://2o9kb51xfph91b7rki281uu9.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Blinn050316LawsuitSettlement.pdf" \t "_blank) in a lawsuit after administrators demanded she seek special permission to advocate for self-defense. How have we let this happen in America, the land of the free? It’s because of what our universities have taught a generation of Americans: If you don’t agree with someone, are uncomfortable with an idea, or don’t find a joke funny, then their speech must be suppressed. [Especially if they don’t politically agree with you](http://www.thecollegefix.com/post/26350/" \t "_blank). Instead of actually debating ideas that span topics from the conventional to the taboo, a generation of American students don’t engage, they just [get enraged](http://www.campusreform.org/?ID=7528" \t "_blank). In doing so, many students believe that they [have a right to literally shut other people up](http://reason.com/blog/2016/09/14/video-more-crazed-yale-students-attack-s" \t "_blank). This is not only a threat to the First Amendment, but also to American democracy. In their manifestation, safe spaces and free-speech zones at public universities enable prejudice against unfavorable ideologies. Guised as progressive measures to ensure inclusion, these often unconstitutional policies exclude new and competing ideas, and are antithetical to a free academia. In excluding different ideologies, supposedly progressive campus speech codes do one thing: prevent the progression of ideas. Restrictive campus speech codes are, in fact, regressive.

#### Thus, the advocacy: Public colleges and universities in the United states ought not restrict constitutionally protected speech

#### First, Counterspeech is especially effective- it bolsters campus-wide movements and mitigates the risk of dealing with censorship issues which sacrifices focus on the movement

**Calleros 95** [Calleros, Charles R. “Paternalism, Counterspeech, and Campus Hate-Speech Codes: A Reply to Delgado and Yun” (Professor of Law, Arizona State University). HeinOnline. Arizona State Law Journal. 1995] NB

Delgado and Yun summarize the support for the counterspeech argument by paraphrasing Nat Hentoff: "[A]ntiracism rules teach black people to depend on whites for protection, while talking back clears the air, emphasizes self-reliance, and strengthens one's self-image as an active agent inchargeofone'sowndestiny."50 DelgadoandYunalsocitetothosewho believe that counterspeech may help educate the racist speaker by addressing 51 the ignorance and fear that lies behind hostile racial stereotyping. But they reject this speech-protective argument, stating that "it is offered blandly, virtually as an article of faith" by those "in a position of power" who "rarely offer empirical proof of their claims. ,,52 The authors argue that talking back in a close confrontation could be physically dangerous, is unlikely to persuade the racist speaker to reform his views, and is impossible "when racist remarks are delivered in a cowardly fashion, by means of graffiti scrawled on a campus wall late at night or on a poster placed outside of a black student's dormitory door." 53 They also complain that "[e]ven when successful, talking back is a burden" that minority undergraduates 54 should not be forced to assume. In rejecting the counterspeech argument, however, Delgado and Yun cast the argument in its weakest possible form, creating an easy target for relatively summary dismissal. When the strategies and experiential basis for successful counterspeech are fairly stated, its value is more easily recognized. First, no responsible free speech advocate argues that a target of hate speech should directly talk back to a racist speaker in circumstances that quickly could lead to a physical altercation. If one or more hateful speakers closely confronts a member of a minority group with racial epithets or other hostile remarks in circumstances that lead the target of the speech to reasonably fear for her safety, in most circumstances she should seek assistance from campus police or other administrators before "talking back." Even staunch proponents of free speech agree that such threatening speech and conduct is subject to regulation and justifies more than a purely educative response. The same would be true of Delgado's and Yun's other examples of speech conveyed in a manner that defaces another's property or 56 When offensive or hateful speech is not threatening, damaging, or impermissibly invasive and therefore may constitute protected speech, 57 education and counterspeech often will be an appropriate response. However, proponents of free speech do not contemplate that counterspeech always, or even normally, will be in the form of an immediate exchange of views between the hateful speaker and his target. Nor do they contemplate that the target should bear the full burden of the response. Instead, effective counterspeech often takes the form of letters, discussions, or demonstrations joined in by many persons and aimed at the entire campus population or a community within it. Typically, it is designed to expose the moral bankruptcy of the hateful ideas, to demonstrate the strength of opinion and numbers of those who deplore the hateful speech, and to spur members of the campus community to take voluntary, constructive action to combat hate and to remedy its ill effects. 58 Above all, it can serve to define and underscore the community of support enjoyed by the targets of the hateful speech, faith in which may have been shaken by the hateful speech. Moreover, having triggered such a reaction with their own voices, the targets of the hateful speech may well feel a sense of empowerment to compensate for the undeniable pain of the speech. 59 One may be tempted to join Delgado and Yun in characterizing such a scenario as one "offered blandly, virtually as an article of faith" and without experiential support. 6° However, campus communities that have creatively used this approach can attest to the surprising power of counterspeech. Examples of counterspeech to hateful racist and homophobic speech at Arizona State and Stanford Universities are especially illustrative.61 In an incident that attracted national attention, the campus community at Arizona State University ("A.S.U.") constructively and constitutionally responded to a racist poster displayed on the outside of the speaker's dormitory door in February 1991. Entitled "WORK APPLICATION," it contained a number of ostensibly employment-related questions that advanced hostile and demeaning racial stereotypes of African-Americans and Mexican-Americans. Carla Washington, one of a group of African- American women who found the poster, used her own speech to persuade a resident of the offending room voluntarily to take the poster down and allow her to photocopy it. After sending a copy of the poster to the campus newspaper along with an opinion letter deploring its racist stereotypes, she demanded action from the director of her residence hall. The director organized an immediate meeting of the dormitory residents to discuss the issues. In this meeting, I explained why the poster was protected by the First Amendment, and the women who found the poster eloquently described their pain and fears. One of the women, Nichet Smith, voiced her fear that all nonminorities on campus shared the hostile stereotypes expressed in the poster. Dozens of residents expressed their support and gave assurances that they did not share the hostile stereotypes, but they conceded that even the most tolerant among them knew little about the cultures of others and would 62 benefit greatly from multicultural education.  The need for multicultural education to combat intercultural ignorance and stereotyping became the theme of a press conference and public rally organized by the student African-American Coalition leader, Rossie Turman, who opted for highly visible counterspeech despite demands from some students and staff to discipline the owner of the offending poster. The result was a series of opinion letters in the campus newspaper discussing the problem of racism, numerous workshops on race relations and free speech, and overwhelming approval in the Faculty Senate of a measure to add a course on American cultural diversity to the undergraduate breadth 63 requirement.  The four women who initially confronted the racist poster were empowered by the meeting at the dormitory residence and later received awards from the local chapter of the NAACP for their activism.64 Rossie Turman was rewarded for his leadership skills two years later by becoming the first African-American elected President of Associated Students of A.S.U.,65 a student body that numbered approximately 40,000 students, only 66 2.3 percent of them African-American. Although Delgado and Yun are quite right that the African-American students should never have been burdened with the need to respond to such hateful speech, Hentoff is correct that the responses just described helped them develop a sense of self-reliance and constructive activism. Moreover, the students' counterspeech inspired a community response that lightened the students' burden and provided them with a sense of community support and empowerment. Indeed, the students received assistance from faculty and administrators, who helped organize meetings, wrote opinion letters, spoke before the Faculty Senate, or joined the students in issuing public statements at the press conference and public rally.67 Perhaps most important, campus administrators wisely refrained from disciplining the owners of the poster, thus directing public attention to the issue of racism and ensuring broad community support in denouncing the racist poster. Many members of the campus and surrounding communities might have leapt to the racist speaker's defense had the state attempted to discipline the speaker and thus had created a First Amendment issue. Instead, they remained united with the offended students because the glare of the public spotlight remained sharply focused on the racist incident without the distraction of cries of state censorship. Although the counterspeech was not aimed primarily at influencing the hearts and minds of the residents of the offending dormitory room, its vigor in fact caught the residents by surprise. 68 It prompted at least three of them to apologize publicly and to display curiosity about a civil rights movement that they were too young to have witnessed first hand. 69 This effective use of education and counterspeech is not an isolated instance at A.S.U., but has been repeated on several occasions, albeit on smaller scales.7° One year after the counterspeech at A.S.U., Stanford University responded similarly to homophobic speech. In that case, a first-year law student sought to attract disciplinary proceedings and thus gain First Amendment martyrdom by shouting hateful homophobic statements about a dormitory staff member. The dean of students stated that the speaker was not subject to discipline under Stanford's code of conduct but called on the university community to speak out on the issue, triggering an avalanche of counterspeech. Students, staff, faculty, and administrators expressed their opinions in letters to the campus newspaper, in comments on a poster board at the law school, in a published petition signed by 400 members of the law school community disassociating the law school from the speaker's epithets, and in a letter written by several law students reporting the incident to a prospective employer of the offending student.71 The purveyor of hate speech indeed had made a point about the power of speech, just not the one he had intended. He had welcomed disciplinary sanctions as a form of empowerment, but the Stanford community was alert enough to catch his verbal hardball and throw it back with ten times the force. Thus, the argument that counterspeech is preferable to state suppression of offensive speech is stronger and more fully supported by experience than is conceded by Delgado and Yun. In both of the cases described above, the targets of hateful speech were supported by a community united against bigotry. The community avoided splitting into factions because the universities eliminated the issue of censorship by quickly announcing that the hateful speakers were protected from disciplinary retaliation. Indeed, the counterspeech against the bigotry was so powerful in each case that it underscored the need for top administrators to develop standards for, and some limitations on, their participation in such partisan speech. 72 Of course, the community action in these cases was effective and empowering precisely because a community against bigotry existed. At A.S.U. and Stanford, as at most universities, the overwhelming majority of students, faculty, and staff are persons of tolerance and good will who deplore at least the clearest forms of bigotry and are ready to speak out Of course, the community action in these cases was effective and empowering precisely because a community against bigotry existed. At A.S.U. and Stanford, as at most universities, the overwhelming majority of students, faculty, and staff are persons of tolerance and good will who deplore at least the clearest forms of bigotry and are ready to speak out against intolerance when it is isolated as an issue rather than diluted in muddied waters along with concerns of censorship. Just as the nonviolent demonstrations of Martin Luther King, Jr., depended partly for their success on the consciences of the national and international audiences monitoring the fire hoses and attack dogs on their television sets and in the print media,73 the empowerment of the targets of hateful speech rests partly in the hands of members of the campus community who sympathize with them. One can hope that the counterspeech and educational measures used with success at A.S.U. and Stanford stand a good chance of preserving an atmosphere of civility in intellectual inquiry at any campus community in which compassionate, open minds predominate. On the other hand, counterspeech by the targets of hate speech could be less empowering on a campus in which the majority of students, faculty, and staff approve of hostile epithets directed toward members of minority groups. One hopes that such campuses are exceedingly rare; although hostile racial stereotyping among college students in the United States increased during the last decade, those students who harbored significant hostilities (as contrasted with more pervasive but less openly hostile, subconscious racism) still represented a modest fraction of all students.74 Moreover, even in a pervasively hostile atmosphere, counterspeech might still be more effective than broad restrictions on speech. First, aside from the constitutional constraints of the First Amendment, such a heartless campus community would be exceedingly unlikely to adopt strong policies prohibiting hateful speech. Instead, the campus likely would maintain minimum policies necessary to avoid legal action enforcing guarantees of equal educational opportunities under the Fourteenth Amendment 75 or federal antidiscrimination statutes such as Title V176 or Title IX. 77 Second, counterspeech even from a minority of members of the campus community might be effective to gradually build support by winning converts from those straddling the fence or from broader regional or national audiences. Such counterspeech might be particularly effective if coupled with threats from diverse faculty, staff, and students to leave the university for more hospitable environments; even a campus with high levels of hostility likely would feel 78 pressures to maintain its status as a minimally integrated institution. The A.S.U. and Stanford examples illustrating the efficacy of counterspeech also lend support to the argument that "[firee speech has been minorities' best friend ...[as] a principal instrument of social reform."79 In both cases, demonstrations, opinion letters, and other forms of counterspeech dramatically defined the predominant atmosphere on each campus as one that demanded respect and freedom from bigotry for all members of the community; it is doubtful that passage of a speech-restrictive policy could have sent a similar message of consensus any more strongly. Moreover, in the A.S.U. case, the reasoned counterspeech, coupled with the decision to refrain from disciplining the hateful speaker, persuaded the Faculty Senate to pass a multicultural education proposal whose chances for passage were seriously in doubt in the previous weeks and months.8 The racist poster at A.S.U. may have been a blessing in disguise, albeit an initially painful one, because it sparked counterspeech and community action that strengthened the campus support for diversity.

#### Second, Protests have been essential to deconstruct facets of the neoliberal university- multiple empirics prove

**Delgado 15** [Delgado, Sandra. “The Pedagogical Potential of Student Collective Action in the Age of the Corporate University” (Doctoral Student in curriculum studies at the university of british Columbia). Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy. University of British Columbia. 2015] NB

One recent movement that has integrated classic and creative repertoires of action is the Chilean student movement of 2011. Among the range of strategies and repertoires of contention that the movement employed, this movement became well-known by the use of creative street performances that were based on the ideas of non-violence, joy, love and carnival. Contextually, the movement emerged as a civil response to the fact that in recent years higher education in Chile has been overtaken by neoliberal reforms that have left about 70% of Chilean students overwhelmed by expensive education loans (Somma, 2012). The student movement advocated free education, the end of for-profit institutions (78% of the funding sources of higher education in Chile are private, according to Bellei, Cabalin and Orellana, 2014), the defense of public education, and the elimination of schools with discriminatory practices (Bellei et al., 2014). In Chile, students are considered important political actors (Guzman-Concha, 2012; Simbuerger & Neary, 2014; Somma, 2012) since, historically, they have been a very active political force. Student federations are a prominent part of student politics in Chile. In 2011, these traditional student organizations incorporated their experiences of previous struggles bringing not only historical grounds to the movement but also contributing with practical and methodological tools to strengthen the movement’s repertoires, narratives and discourses (Guzman-Concha, 2012, p. 414) One of the tactics that reflect the pedagogical aspects of student organizing mentioned above is the employment of irony and humor to illustrate the burden of student debt, provoke critical reflection to the public and incite people to take action. For example, one of the ideas that Chilean students used the most as a humor device was the idea of Love. Marches and kiss-ins (besatones) were filled with messages that included both, meanings associated to the idea of love and the feelings and experiences of being in debt. Students, most of the cases, either compared or contrasted both ideas by using sarcasm and irony. For example, students used messages such as: “our love is infinite, our money would not last that much”, “I would like to be a student loan, so we could be together for the rest of our lives”, “We are deeply in love but most of all we are dangerously in debt”, and “if love is free, why education is not?” Students’ messages reflect an antagonistic logic of two concepts that inspire opposite feelings, where the idea of love has a positive connotation and debt, on the contrary, brings sorrow and anguish. Hence, the associate meanings of love are not transferable to the idea of debt without becoming a joke. The messages used by Chilean students underline the idea that love and affection could potentially be disruptive for the logic of debt and economization and their suggestion, open to interpretation, is that society should think and organize an education system that incorporates the logic of love instead of the logic of economic growth and profit. Another dimension of the pedagogical potential of student performances and repertoires of contention is illustrated by the evolution in the arguments that students used during their negotiations. As Somma (2012) shows the movement developed comprehensive and sound understandings of how the Chilean education system works. Strategies the movement needed to employ were precisely pedagogical, in the sense that students organized themselves to gain and share more knowledge about the ways in which the Chilean higher education system works. This effort suggested a pedagogical endeavor not only for understanding particular information, data and specialized knowledge about the reality of Chilean education, but also developing the language and the tools needed to make that knowledge translatable (Somma, 2012). Both aspects were important for the movement in order to publically challenge the discourses that government officials used to gain the public’s attention and delegitimize the movement. These dynamics illustrate an internal organization, pursuing the intention to learn and share information about the issue that students were caring about, and directly speaks to Holt’s insight about curiosity, “it grows out of real concerns and real need.” (Holt, 2004, p. 12). The student movement in Colombia led by the Mesa Amplia Nacional Estudiantil – MANE – used performances and repertoires similar to those employed in the 2011 Chilean movement. In the Colombian context, as it is described by Archila (2011), the movement originated after the government attempted to reform the national law called “Ley 30 de 1990,” that defined how universities receive their funding. The reform sought to increase competition among institutions and encourage the advance of corporate managerialism to carry out the day- to-day operations of the universities. In their movement, Colombian students employed both classic repertoires such as strikes, mobilizations, assemblies, and creative strategies, such as kiss- ins and marches using humor, costumes and ironical and sarcastic frames. Additionally, they added contextual elements from national carnivals and holiday festivities (Archila, 2011). One element particularly helpful to understand the pedagogical potential of the movement tactics and the symbolic aspects of their performances of contention is the strategy called “pupitrazo.” This strategy consists of moving desk and chairs (pupitres) outside of the university classrooms, to public parks, streets and outdoor areas to either have lessons there or to discuss and debate particular issues of interest. This strategy had dual objectives. The first goal was to disrupt the logic that universities are contained within the boundaries of enclosed spaces. By using this strategy, students opened a space where they could inquiry into the purposes of their own education and the connections that their studentship has and potentially could have when it meets social reality, inequities, poverty and so on. Secondly, students also disrupted the quotidian use of streets, parks and public spaces by physically occupying them as spaces to learn and debate. The strategy provokes reflection among participants and observers about the public character of higher education and the artificial separations between academic institutions, knowledge, and social reality as it is presented day by day, out in the streets. Among other examples of the pedagogical potential of students’ performances and repertoires of contention, Fernández (2014) analyses the use of “Book Blocs” as a type of action used in contemporary student protests. This strategy become famous for its use in the building occupations carried out by UK students in 2010. Fernández explains how by using “Book Blocs” students borrow symbols and meanings traditionally associated to the academy. Book blocs are big rectangular pieces of cardboard with colorful images of covers from books that are well- known for being sources of inspiration, reflection and critical thought (e.g. the covers of Marx’s Capital, Fanon’s The Wretched of the Earth, Tillich’s DE schooling Society, De Beauvoir’s The Second Sex, etc.). As Ambler puts it, students “do not shield themselves behind knowledge, but hold before them the symbolic promise of all the radical traditions of oppositional knowledge and politics signified through these works” (Amsler, 2011, p. 5). These pieces are used as the front line to open marches, to block buildings, or as banners and signs located around campuses. They represent the relations that the movements have with intellectual theories and philosophical thinking, allowing a space where “social theory is materialized not only in practice, but as practice” (Amsler, 2011, p. 5). Fernandez (2014), Ambler (2011) and others have argued that “Book Blocs” are also a good example of the diffusion of knowledge among contemporary student movements, since the initiative was created by students in Italy and quickly spread to Spain, London and even more recently it was part of student demonstrations at City University of New York in the US. One of the most studied and theorized repertoires of contention is the occupation of buildings and in the case of students, the occupation of campuses. For instance, Lewis (2013) argues that blockades and building occupations allow an interaction between people and ideas, since it opens a space for them to converge in a state of suspension because in building occupations, for example, students have the opportunity to organize themselves by assuring the availability of “free time” and “free space” to think and struggle. As Fernandez (2014) argues occupations have the goal of achieving “the social time necessary to articulate the protest and, at the same time, to break with the faculty daily routine and visualize the conflict inside the institution” (p. 207). Taking the argument even further, Lewis (2013) argues that occupations have the particularity that allows students the chance to reclaim the “state of suspension” that belongs to the act of studying something. Hence, by blocking their buildings students gain back their “free time” needed to seriously study an issue, space that is no longer granted by the corporate university. “Letting things idle through occupation stops or interrupts the incessant need for ‘results’ and is itself a kind of impotent result, or a result that withdraws from calculation and measures” (p. 154). Occupations disrupt the economic logics that have overtaken learning, such as calculation, accountability; testing, etc. these aspects of the economic world are deeply entrenched into today’s forms of corporatized learning, and are part of the bio-politics of neoliberal capitalism. When students disrupt this logic they are reclaiming the essence of what it means to study (Lewis, 2013). Often, when the literature refers to students, it does so in a way that locates them as if their social value were tangible only in the future. In other words, students’ possibilities to transform reality is not placed in the present, but somewhere in the future, either at the moment when they have their degree, or get a job, or are acknowledged as incorporated in the economic system of production. By taking an approach that accounts for the pedagogical and political possibilities that students social action has in the present, students gain back their transformative potential not as an abstract end that waits to be made present, but as part of the actual moment they are living as students (Fernández, 2014; Weiss, Aspinall, Abinales, & Ortmann, 2012).Student social action then becomes a vehicle by itself that offers the possibility to engage here and now, as part of a process of becoming that starts and has roots in the present moment (Malott & Ford, 2015). Furthermore, student’s repertoires of contention and direct action can be understood as part of what Vinson and Ross (2011, 2013) call “dangerous citizenship”, since as they argue: The pedagogical power of “dangerous citizenship,” resides in its capacity to encourage students ... to challenge the implications of their own education or work, to envision an education that is free and democratic to the core, and to interrogate and uncover their own well-intentioned complicity in the conditions within which various cultural texts and practices appear, especially to the extent that oppressive conditions create oppressive cultural practices, and vice versa. (Ross & Vinson, 2013, p. 15) Therefore, student movements and their repertoires of contention have the potential to be alternative spaces that facilitate formative and pedagogical experiences as they contribute to critical reflection, social engagement and action on specific social issues.

#### Third, free speech bolsters movements that create affective bonds between people- shifting away from a rugged individualist mindset, rather one of unity

**Delgado 15** [Delgado, Sandra. “The Pedagogical Potential of Student Collective Action in the Age of the Corporate University” (Doctoral Student in curriculum studies at the university of british Columbia). Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy. University of British Columbia. 2015] NB

Social movements are filled with learning experiences. They are spaces of social engagement, encounter, creation and transformation. However, as the American educator John Holt argues in his book Instead of Education, we are always learning, and there is not really a classification or division of experiences between the ones that are conducive to learning and the ones that are not. He says: The trouble with talk about “learning experiences” is that it implies that all experiences can be divided into two kinds, those from which we learn something, and those from which we learn nothing. But there are no experiences from which we learn nothing. What we learn may make us more informed or more ignorant, wiser or stupider, stronger or weaker, but we always learn something. What it is depends on the experience, and above all, on how we feel about it ..... We are very unlikely to learn anything good from experiences which do not seem to us closely connected with what is interesting and important in the rest of our lives. Curiosity is never idle; it grows out of real concerns and real needs [emphasis added]. (Holt, 2004, p. 12) For Holt learning is a product of human experiences, and curiosity is the trigger of the kind of learning that is long lasting, that connects to us and means something. Social movements are spaces that may offer precisely that, the interaction between learning experiences, social engagement and political practices among people that are truly concerned and interested about an issue (Choudry, 2015; Hall & Turray, 2006; Hall, B. L., Clover, D. E., Crowther, J. & Scandrett, 2012). Student movements, as a form of collective action, also constitute a similar educational space that combines elements and potentialities for learning, creation and curiosity. Furthermore, social movements besides being spaces where people socially engage and learn, also have the potential to be pedagogical (understanding pedagogy from a broader social perspective that goes outside classroom settings and embraces the complexity of social interactions). In this regard Ross (2015) argues, drawing form a dialectical understanding of human experience and the relations between thinking and acting, that experiences become educational – and pedagogical - when they are “critically examined in relation to the past, present, and the future.” Additionally, he argues that pedagogical experiences can also account for the “external conditions (that) interact with the subjectivities of the person having the experience(s)” (p. 152). In other words, pedagogical experiences are relational and socially grounded since they are the result of social interaction. Additionally, pedagogical experiences are reflective and critical because they are connected and rooted dialectically in human experience. As Ross (2015) puts it “(a)n educative experience suggests the past is part of who we are now and that the present is important as a precondition for resolving major social contradictions in the future.” (p. 152). Lastly, pedagogical experiences are meaningful because they “help us construct personally meaningful understandings of the world and in the process to make change” (p. 152)

#### Fourth, Students fight debt and normalized education in order to reclaim radical thought- the current model of education destroys true radical thinking

**Giroux 13** [Henry A. Giroux (McMaster Univeristy Professor for Scholarship in Public Interest and the Paulo Freire Distingusiehd Scholar in Critical Pedagogy”, 10-29-2013, "Henry A. Giroux," Truthout, <http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university>] NB

What happens to education when it is treated like a corporation? What are we to make of the integrity of a university when it accepts a monetary gift from powerful corporate interests or rich patrons demanding as part of the agreement the power to specify what is to be taught in a course or how a curriculum should be shaped? Some corporations and universities now believe that what is taught in a course is not an academic decision but a market consideration. In addition, many disciplines are now valued almost exclusively with how closely they align with what might be euphemistically called a business culture. One egregious example of this neoliberal approach to higher education is on full display in Florida, where Gov. Rick Scott's task force on education is attempting to implement a policy that would lower tuition for degrees friendly to corporate interests in order to "steer students toward majors that are in demand in the job market."[19](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university#XVIII) Scott's utterly instrumental and anti-intellectual message is clear: "Give us engineers, scientists, health-care specialists and technology experts. Do not worry so much about historians, philosophers, anthropologists and English majors."[20](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university#IXX) Not only does neoliberalism undermine both civic education and public values and confuse education with training, it also wages a war on what might be called the radical imagination. For instance, thousands of students in both the United States and Canada are now saddled with debts that will profoundly impact their lives and their futures, likely forcing them away from public service jobs because the pay is too low to pay off their educational loans. Students find themselves in a world in which heightened expectations have been replaced by dashed hopes and a world of onerous debt.[21](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university#XX) Struggling to merely survive, the debt crisis represents a massive assault on the imagination by leaving little or no room to think otherwise in order to act otherwise. David Graeber is right in insisting that the student loan crisis is part of a war on the imagination. He writes:

#### Student bodies are essential flashpoints to create social change- they are diverse classes that foster difference

**Delgado 15** [Delgado, Sandra. “The Pedagogical Potential of Student Collective Action in the Age of the Corporate University” (Doctoral Student in curriculum studies at the university of british Columbia). Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy. University of British Columbia. 2015] NB

During the last decade students have played a prominent role, as part of the many resistance efforts against the privatization of the university. They have organized massive movements, occupied campuses and buildings, and they have made extraordinary and creative demonstrations to raise the public’s awareness about the consequences of the corporatization of higher education (Hill, 2013). Among the most popular and studied movements of the decade are the ones that took place in 2011 in Chile (Salinas & Fraser, 2012; Somma, 2012) and 2010 in England (Ibrahim, 2011). In these cases, students not only organized unprecedented large marches and public demonstrations, but also they inspired many subsequent national and transnational movements. As students’ collective actions keep gaining more political relevance, student and university movements also establish themselves as spaces of counter-hegemony (Sotiris, 2014). Students are constantly opening new possibilities to displace and resist the commodification of education offered by mainstream educational institutions. As Sotiris (2014) convincingly argues, movements within the university have not only the potential to subvert educational reforms, but in addition, they have become “strategic nodes” for the transformation of the processes and practices in higher education, and most importantly for the constant re-imagination and the recreation of “new forms of subaltern counter-hegemony” (p. 1). The strategic importance of university and college based moments lays precisely in the role that higher education plays in contemporary societies, namely their role in “the development of new technologies, new forms of production and for the articulation of discourses and theories on contemporary issues and their role in the reproduction of state and business personnel.” (p.8) Universities and colleges therefore, have a crucial contribution in “the development of class strategies (both dominant and subaltern), in the production of subjectivities, (and) in the transformation of collective practices” (p.8) The main objective of this paper is to examine how contemporary student movements are disrupting, opposing and displacing entrenched oppressive and dehumanizing reforms, practices and frames in today’s corporate academia. This work is divided in four sections. The first is an introduction to student movements and an overview of how student political action has been approached and researched. The second and third sections take a closer look at the repertoires of contention used by contemporary student movements and propose a framework based on radical praxis that allows us to better understand the pedagogical potential of student disruptive action. The last section contains a series of examples of students’ repertoires or tactics of contention that exemplifies the pedagogical potential of student social and political action. Generally speaking, students are well positioned as political actors. They have been actively involved in the politics of education since the beginnings of the university, but more broadly, students have played a significant role in defining social, cultural and political environments around the world (Altbach, 1966; Boren, 2001). The contributions and influences of students and student movements to revolutionary efforts and political movements beyond the university context are undeniable. One example is the role that students have played in the leadership and membership of the political left (e.g. students’ role in the Movimiento 26 de Julio - M-26-7 in Cuba during the 50’s and in the formation of The New Left in the United States, among others). Similarly, several political and social movements have either established alliances with student organizations or created their own chapters on campuses to recruit new members, mobilize their agendas in education and foster earlier student’s involvement in politics2 (Altbach, 1966; Lipset, 1969). Students are often considered to be “catalysts” of political and social action or “barometers” of the social unrest and political tension accumulated in society (Barker, 2008). Throughout history student movements have had a diverse and sometimes contradictory range of political commitments. Usually, student organizations and movements find grounding and inspiration in Anarchism and Marxism, however it is also common to see movements leaning towards liberal and conservative approaches. Hence, student political action has not always been aligned with social movements or organizations from the political left. In various moments in history students have joined or been linked to rightist movements, reactionary organizations and conservative parties (Altbach, 1966; Barker, 2008). Students, unlike workers, come from different social classes and seemly different cultural backgrounds. As a particularly diverse social group, students are distinguished for being heterogeneous and pluralists in their values, interests and commitments (Boren, 2001). Such diversity has been a constant challenge for maintaining unity, which has been particularly problematic in cases of national or transnational student organizations (Prusinowska, Kowzan, & Zielińska, 2012; Somma, 2012). To clarify, social classes are defined by the specific relationship that people have with the means of production. In the case of students, they are not a social class by themselves, but a social layer or social group that is identifiable by their common function in society (Stedman, 1969). The main or central aspect that unites student is the transitory social condition of being a student. In other words, students are a social group who have a common function, role in society or social objective, which is “to study” something (Lewis, 2013; Simons & Masschelein, 2009). Student movements can be understood as a form of social movement (Luesher- Mamashela, 2015). They have an internal organization that varies from traditionally hierarchical structures, organizational schemes based on representative democracy with charismatic leadership, to horizontal forms of decision-making (Altbach, 1966; Lipset, 1969). As many other movements, student movements have standing claims, organize different type of actions, tactics or repertoires of contention,3 and they advocate for political, social or/and educational agendas, programs or pleas. Student political activity has been studied by scholars in social movements, youth activism, communication, anthropology, sociology and history. Outside of mainstream academic publishing, activists and militants have also contributed to document experiences of student activism by writing booklets, autobiographies, weblogs, music and poetry (e.g. from Goliardic poetry in medieval Europe to contemporary song writing). Some activists have also registered their experiences and perspectives in storied form and their work can be found as part of the literary genre.4

# 1AR- Case

## Extension

### V2 Ext- Framing

#### First—neolib has infilitrated higher education.

#### 1. Extend Giroux 13- Neolib has changed the academy and ethics: Ethical standpoints are no longer objective because they privelege rationality to serve corporate interests They have sacrificed educational spaces of higher education by priveleging support of corporations.

#### 2.. Extend Giroux 13- neolib is a prior question to any of the 1NCs impacts, minorities are considered disposable because they aren't labeled as 'productive' for neoliberalism. This is a framing issue- neolib is the top level impact

#### 3. education itself has been framed through neoliberalism such as standardized testing, rankings, students become consumers and only activism can change it-- that's Williams

#### It’s try or die to reclaim the academy- they need to win uniqueness in order to win a link turn- otherwise neolib is so high that we don’t increase it that much

### V2 Ext- Uniqueness

#### Now- current policies through universities restrict free speech to individuals—that has horrible impacts

#### universities restrict free speech now through various methods- proves the aff is inherent- that's Maloney

#### alt right is energized in the status quo- students are recruited to engage in harmful dialogue- that's Harkinson

#### The state seeks contains protestors and geopolitically isolates protest from politics- the impact is the destruction of any liberated future- That’ elmer and Opel

### V2 Ext- Solvency

#### Finally- the aff solves these impacts there are multiple links

#### 1. Counterspeech is effective and has empirically boosted campus movements. censorship shifts the focus from the movement and is never effective-- thats Calleros

#### 2. Free speech has been essential to provoke protests that have countered neolib in the academy- empirical movements for free education, public funding, symbolic strategies prove- that's delgado 15

#### the aff is an essential starting point- student bodies are political diverse magnets and campuses serve to accleerate political change- that's Delgado- we have a large strength of link

#### This last card provides an internal link for why we solve best for neolib

## Framing

### XT: Framing

#### xt: framing

#### Extend Giroux 13- Neolib has changed the academy and ethics: Ethical standpoints are no longer objective because they privelege rationality to serve corporate interests, no longer care about inequality, and abstract away from real material conditions of suffering. They have sacrificed educational spaces of higher education by priveleging support of corporations.

#### Extend Giroux 13- This is an impact level card- neolib is a prior question to any of the 1NCs impacts, minorities are considered disposable because they aren't labeled as 'productive' for neoliberalism. This is a framing issue- neolib is the top level impact

## Solvency

### XT: uq

#### alt right is energized in the status quo- students are recruited to engage in harmful dialogue- that's Harkinson

#### status quo agencies and military funds push students into research projects that strengthen neoliberalism and profits- that's Giroux

#### education itself has been framed through neoliberalism such as standardized testing, rankings, students become consumers and only activism can change it-- that's Williams

#### universities restrict free speech now through various methods- proves the aff is inherent- that's Maloney

### XT: Solvency + Adv

#### the case solves- only lifting restrictions on speech can start the movement against neolib.

#### 1. Counterspeech is effective and has empirically boosted campus movements. censorship shifts the focus from the movement and is never effective-- thats Calleros

#### 2. Free speech has been essential to provoke protests that have countered neolib in the academy- empirical movements for free education, public funding, symbolic strategies prove- that's delgado 15

#### 3. Free speech movements use affect and community movements to shift away from an individualist mindset which chips away at neolib- that's Delgado

#### 4. Free speech methods help fight debt and propose various types of education that value critical thought instead of normalized education- that's Giroux-

#### the aff is an essential starting point- student bodies are political diverse magnets and campuses serve to accleerate political change- that's Delgado- we have a large strength of link

### AT: Protests ØUQ

#### Requiring campus administration approval for demonstration is part of this militaristic knowledge production-- Advance notices prevent productive activism – the impact of student’s messages are diminished significantly as a result of having to wait approval

Harris 12 Samantha Harris November 6, 2012. *Misunderstanding ‘Time, Place, and Manner’ Restrictions.* Foundation for Individual Rights in Education. https://www.thefire.org/misunderstanding-time-place-and-manner-restrictions/

**Another** common **flaw in demonstration policies is a requirement that students give advanced notice of all expressive activities or**, worse, **that they obtain prior administrative approval for all such activities.** At the University of Arizona, for example, "[a]ctivities/events that are expected to attract more than 25 people, or that are advertised in any medium, must be preceeded [sic] by completion and approval of a Campus Use Activity Form not less than ten (10) business days prior to the expected time of such activities." **Regarding the first point, although it is understandable that universities will want prior notice of student demonstrations where possible, there must always be some allowance for unscheduled expressive activities. This is because demonstrations and protests are often spontaneous responses to unfolding events** (think of the Virginia Tech massacre, or 9/11), **and requiring students to wait any meaningful amount of time to hold a protest might significantly diminish, if not altogether eliminate, the impact of their message.** With respect to the second point**, requiring prior administrative approval of student expressive activities is** almost certainly an **unconstitutional prior restraint on speech. As the U.S. Supreme Court has stated: "It is offensive—**not only **to the values protected by the First Amendment**, but to the very notion of a free society—**that in the context of everyday public discourse a citizen must first inform the government of her desire to speak to her neighbors and then obtain a permit to do so."**Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of NY, Inc. v. Village of Stratton, 536 U.S. 150, 165-66 (2002).

## Extra

### US Protests Break Down Neolib

#### US prsotests help break down neoliberal focuses on campus- Koch movement proves

**Mulhere 14** [Kaitlin Mulhere, 11-4-2014, "Students want Koch, corporate influence off campus," No Publication, <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/11/04/students-want-koch-corporate-influence-campus>] NB

Students on nearly 30 campuses around the country called for a separation of college and corporation in protests Monday. Although the events highlighted financial influence from the Koch brothers, organizers said the campaign is a response to a broader trend of corporate influence. The idea was spearheaded by students at Florida State University, where past criticisms over the university’s relationship with the Charles Koch Foundation are now intertwined with criticism of choice of a politician without an academic background for university president. Outside of Florida, students at colleges from Michigan to Virginia also took steps Monday against their respective colleges' relationship with the Koch brothers. Libertarian billionaires Charles and David Koch have been funneling millions of dollars to universities for several years, generally paying for the hiring of new faculty members and supporting economic centers that focus on capitalism and free enterprise. Critics say that some of the arrangement go beyond philanthropy to influencing curricular or hiring choices in inappropriate ways that colleges should reject. Groups affiliated with the Koch brothers foundations have repeatedly denied that financial support of colleges infringes on academic freedom and did so when asked for a comment on Monday's campaign. “Academic freedom and the free exchange of ideas are cornerstones of our philanthropy," said John Hardin, a program officer with the Charles Koch Foundation, in an email. "When we support a school’s initiative, it is to expand opportunity and increase the diversity of ideas available on campus.” A recently launched “[UnKoch My Campus](http://www.unkochmycampus.org/)” campaign helped advertise for Monday's events, which aimed to raise awareness on campuses that receive money tied to the Koch brothers and to unite already-existing protests on individual campuses.

# Neolib Bad

## 1AR- Framing

### Case Overview

#### 1. The role of the ballot is centered on knowledge production- even if cap is good for material purposes, that’s because they prevent critical thought which is necessary to truly undress the horrors of capitalism

#### 2. Their impact turns assume complete socialism but the 1AC only prevents violence under capitalism to create social democracy that's Giroux 13 which is a step in the right direction to capitalism but not a complete abandonment yet- their impacts have a certain brink which we haven’t crossed

#### 3. Our Uniqueness evidence proves that exploitation is increasing even under pure current capitalism through corporate domination- their evidence assumes complete cap with social reforms like the aff that correct for it’s unsustainability and exploitation that make populations disposable

### 1AR- Extinction Impact

#### The impact is extinction – neoliberal social organization ensures extinction from resource wars, climate change, and structural violence – only transitioning away from neoliberalism can resolve its impacts

#### WILLIAMS AND SRNICEK 13

(Alex, PhD student at the University of East London, presently at work on a thesis entitled 'Hegemony and Complexity', Nick, PhD candidate in International Relations at the London School of Economics, Co-authors of the forthcoming Folk Politics, 14 May 2013, http://criticallegalthinking.com/2013/05/14/accelerate-manifesto-for-an-accelerationist-politics/)

At the begin­ning of the second dec­ade of the Twenty-​First Cen­tury, global civilization faces a new breed of cataclysm. These com­ing apo­ca­lypses ridicule the norms and organ­isa­tional struc­tures of the polit­ics which were forged in the birth of the nation-​state, the rise of cap­it­al­ism, and a Twen­ti­eth Cen­tury of unpre­ced­en­ted wars. 2. Most significant is the break­down of the planetary climatic system. In time, this threatens the continued existence of the present global human population. Though this is the most crit­ical of the threats which face human­ity, a series of lesser but potentially equally destabilising problems exist along­side and inter­sect with it. Terminal resource depletion, especially in water and energy reserves, offers the prospect of mass starvation, collapsing economic paradigms, and new hot and cold wars. Continued financial crisis has led governments to embrace the para­lyz­ing death spiral policies of austerity, privatisation of social welfare services, mass unemployment, and stagnating wages. Increasing automation in production processes includ­ing ‘intel­lec­tual labour’ is evidence of the secular crisis of capitalism, soon to render it incapable of maintaining current standards of living for even the former middle classes of the global north. 3. In con­trast to these ever-​accelerating cata­strophes, today’s politics is beset by an inability to generate the new ideas and modes of organisation necessary to transform our societies to confront and resolve the coming annihilations. While crisis gath­ers force and speed, polit­ics with­ers and retreats. In this para­lysis of the polit­ical ima­gin­ary, the future has been cancelled. 4. Since 1979, the hegemonic global political ideology has been neoliberalism, found in some vari­ant through­out the lead­ing eco­nomic powers. In spite of the deep struc­tural chal­lenges the new global prob­lems present to it, most imme­di­ately the credit, fin­an­cial, and fiscal crises since 2007 – 8, neoliberal programmes have only evolved in the sense of deep­en­ing. This continuation of the neo­lib­eral pro­ject, or neo­lib­er­al­ism 2.0, has begun to apply another round of structural adjustments, most sig­ni­fic­antly in the form of encour­aging new and aggress­ive incur­sions by the private sec­tor into what remains of social demo­cratic insti­tu­tions and ser­vices. This is in spite of the immediately negative eco­nomic and social effects of such policies, and the longer term fun­da­mental bar­ri­ers posed by the new global crises.

### 2AR- Impact OV

#### Extinction is inevitable without a new political ideology – the system is reaching its ecological limits - profit-driven ideologies destroy the environment through resource depletion - neolib exacerbates poverty, social inequalities and mass unemployment – conceals a modern version of slavery with millions of oppressed workers who have become reduced modes of profit – that’s Williams and Srnicek – means we have terminal uniqueness and its try or die for the aff

### Internal Link Hijack

#### Social democracy is undoubtedly the best system – aff adjusts cap to make it work, while alternatives consistently fail. Internal link hijack to cap,

**ROSE 12**

Rose 12 [Gideon, Editor of Foreign Affairs and the Peter G. Peterson chair at the Council on Foreign Relations, January/February, “Making Modernity Work,” http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136776/gideon-rose/making-modernity-work/AKG]

As the political scientist Sheri Berman has observed, "The postwar order represented something historically unusual: capitalism remained, but it was capitalism of a very different type from that which had existed before the war— one tempered and limited by the power of the democratic state and often made subservient to the goals of social stability and solidarity, rather than the other way around." Berman calls the mixture "social democracy" Other scholars use other terms: Jan-Werner Miller prefers "Christian Democracy," John Ruggie suggests "embedded liberalism," Karl Dietrich Bracher talks of "democratic liberalism." Francis Fukuyama wrote of "the end of History"; Daniel Bell and Seymour Martin Lipset saw it as "the end of ideology." All refer to essentially the same thing. As Bell put it in i960: Few serious minds believe any longer that one can set down "blueprints" and through "social engineering" bring about a new Utopia of social harmony. At the same time, the older "counter-beliefs" have lost their intellectual force as well. Few "classic" liberals insist that the State should play no role in the economy, and few serious conservatives, at least in England and on the Continent, believe that the Welfare State is "the road to serfdom." In the Western world, therefore, there is today a rough consensus among intellectuals on political issues: the acceptance of a Welfare State; the desirability of decentralized power; a system of mixed economy and of political pluralism. Reflecting the hangover of the inter-war ideological binge, the system stressed not transcendence but compromise. It offered neither salvation nor Utopia, only a framework within which citizens could pursue their personal betterment. It has never been as satisfying as the religions, sacred or secular, it replaced. And it remains a work in progress, requiring tinkering and modification as conditions and attitudes change. Yet its success has been manifest— and reflecting that, its basic framework has remained remarkably intact. THE ONCE AND FUTURE ORDER The central question of modernity has been how to reconcile capitalism and mass democracy, and since the postwar order came up with a good answer, it has managed to weather all subsequent challenges. The upheavals of the late 1960s seemed poised to disrupt it. But despite what activists at the time thought, they had little to offer in terms of politics or economics, and so their lasting impact was on social life instead. This had the ironic effect of stabilizing the system rather than overturning it, helping it live up to its full potential by bringing previously subordinated or disenfranchised groups inside the castle walls. The neoliberal revolutionaries of the 1980s also had little luck, never managing to turn the clock back all that far. All potential alternatives in the developing world, meanwhile, have proved to be either dead ends or temporary detours from the beaten path. The much-ballyhooed "rise of the rest" has involved not the dis-crediting of the postwar order of Western political economy but its reinforcement: the countries that have risen have done so by embracing global capitalism while keeping some of its destabilizing attributes in check, and have liberalized their polities and societies along the way (and will founder unless they continue to do so). Although the structure still stands, however, it has seen better days. Poor management of public spending and fiscal policy has resulted in unsustainable levels of debt across the advanced industrial world, even as mature economies have found it difficult to generate dynamic growth and full employment in an ever more globalized environment. Lax regulation and oversight allowed reckless and predatory financial practices to drive leading economies to the brink of collapse. Economic inequality has increased as social mobility has declined. And a loss of broad-based social solidarity on both sides of the Atlantic has eroded public support for the active remedies needed to address these and other problems. Renovating the structure will be a slow and difficult project, the cost and duration of which remain unclear, as do the contractors involved. Still, at root, this is not an ideological issue. The question is not what to do but how to do it—how, under twenty-first-century conditions, to rise to the challenge Laski described, making the modern political economy provide enough solid benefit to the mass of men that they see its continuation as a matter of urgency to themselves.

### AT Inevitable

#### 1. Neoliberalism is only inevitable because of the neoliberal market structure that necessitates it – that means only a shift away from neoliberal discourse can allow for an objective evaluation

#### Notions of inevitable neoliberalism are a product of discursive presuppositions—by questioning them it can be overcome

#### HAY AND ROSAMOND 02

Hay and Rosamond, Reader in Political Analysis in the Department of Political Science and International Studies at the University of Birmingham and Senior Research Fellow in International Politics in the Centre for the Study of Globalisation and Regionalisation at the University of Warwick respectively, 02, (Colin and Ben, “Globalisation, European Integration and the Discursive Construction of Economic Imperatives”, Journal of European Public Policy 9:2, 4/02, <http://users.ox.ac.uk/~ssfc0041/globalisation.pdf>)//AS

And it is easy to see why. For the effects of having internalised or deployed strategically assumptions about globalisation may, in time, become almost as entrenched as if they were produced by an inexorable globalising logic. The effects of tax competition are, after all, no less real if informed by assumptions about the mobility of capital which are demonstrably false. Moreover, once established, the momentum of a process such as tax competition may be difficult to halt.Does it matter, then, whether the effects frequently attributed to globalisation are direct products of the demonstrable ‘material reality’ of globalisationor of more or less accurate constructions of globalisation’s assumed imperatives or of an entirely duplicitous appeal to globalisation’s convenient exigencies? Whilst in one sense it may not (the immediate outcome, after all, is the same), in another the difference is extremely significant. In one account we identify an inexorable and fatalistic unfolding economic ‘logic of no alternative’ operating beyond the control or purview of political actors whom we might hold accountable for its consequences. In the other two we have an open-ended, contingent and — crucially — political dynamic to which potentially accountable agents might be linked (see also Hay 2000). Differentiating between the effects of globalisation on the one hand and the effects of dominant discourses of globalisation and the use made of such discourses on the other is, then, an integral aspect of restoring notions of political responsibility and accountability to contemporary political and economic dynamics. It is a prime motivation for much of what follows.

#### 2. Not a reason to vote neg – if we win its bad you should still vote aff because the links act as turns – aff also resovles it

#### 3. Rejecting the notion of inevitable neoliberalism is critical to resistance

#### HURSH AND HENDERSON 11

Hursh and Henderson, associate professor of education at the University of Rochester and PhD at the Warner Graduate School of Education and Human Development 11 (David and Joseph, “ Contesting global neoliberalism and creating alternative futures”, Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education 32:2, May 2011, Routledge)//AS

Contesting neoliberalism necessitates that we situate neoliberal policies within the larger neoliberal discourse promoting markets, competition, individualism, and privatization. Analysing education policies in the USA, whether the push for mayoral control in Rochester, New York (see Duffy, 2010; Hedeen, 2010; Ramos, 2010), school reform policies under Renaissance 2010 in Chicago, or Race to the Top under the Obama administration, requires that we understand how reforms such as using standardized testing are presented as efficient, neutral responses to the problem of raising student achievement, rather than examining the root causes of student failure, including lack of decent paying jobs and health care, and under-funded schools. Current policies reinforce neoliberalism and leave the status quo intact. Similarly, if we look at education in Sub-Saharan Africa, we must situate schools within the hollowing out of the state, and the lack of adequate funding for education and other social services such as health care. For example, in Uganda, as in several other Sub-Saharan countries, the global recession has contributed to drug shortages, making it impossible to treat the growing number of AIDS patients (McNeil, 2010). Yet, under more social democratic policies the state would play a larger role in providing health care. Furthermore, education is increasingly contested, as the plutocracy promotes education as a means of producing productive, rather than critical, employees. Schools are more often places where teachers and students learn what will be on the test rather than seeking answers to questions that cry out for answers, such as how to develop a healthy, sustainable environment or communities where people are actually valued for who they are rather than what they contribute to the economy. Instead, we must ask what kinds of relations do we want to nurture, what kinds of social relations, what kind of work do we want to do, and what kinds of culture and technologies do we want to create. These questions require that we rethink schools so that teachers and students can engage in real questions for which the answer will make a difference in the quality of our lives. These questions also require that we rethink our relationship to a specific kind of ‘free’ marketplace that is not, in fact, inevitable. By problematizing the idea of neoliberal marketization, we can begin to construct new markets that actually value commonly held resources and local communities.

## Other Frontlines in Frontlines Doc